NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES
3 3433 06819428 5



HISTORY

OF THE

CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

BY

HENRY C. SHELDON,

AUTHOR OF "HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE," AND PROFESSOR
IN BOSTON UNIVERSITY.

VOL. IV.

THE MODERN CHURCH.

Part Second.

NEW YORK: 46 EAST 14TH STREET.
THOMAS Y. CROWELL & CO.
BOSTON: 100 PURCHASE STREET.
1894.

NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY



Copyright, 1894,
By Henry C. Sheldon.

University Press:
John Wilson and Son, Cambridge, U.S.A.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

PAGE

I. THE NONJURORS 1
II. THE DEISTICAL CONTROVERSY 9
III. THE MORAL AND RELIGIOUS CONDITION OF ENGLAND ON THE EVE OF THE GREAT REVIVAL 26
IV. THE GREAT REVIVAL 33
1. Beginnings of Methodism 34
2. Whitefield and Calvinistic Methodism 53
3. Charles Wesley and Methodist Hymnology . . 62
4. John Wesley and Organized Methodism . . . 64
5. Results of the Revival 92
V. ENGLISH DISSENTERS 95
VI. PRINCIPAL DEVELOPMENTS IN SCOTLAND 105
VII. IRELAND FROM THE REVOLUTION TO THE UNION (1691–1800) 113

CHAPTER II.

AMERICA IN THE COLONIAL ERA.

I. THE COLONIES IN THEIR POLITICAL RELATIONS . . . 126
II. THE COLONIES IN THEIR RELATIONS TO THE NATIVES . 158
III. ROMAN CATHOLIC ESTABLISHMENTS 181
IV. ROMAN CATHOLICS IN THE ENGLISH COLONIES . . . 187
V. CHURCH OF ENGLAND ESTABLISHMENTS, AND THE FOUNDING OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH . . . 196

VI. Congregational Establishments 213
VII. Non-Established Communions 249
1. Presbyterians 249
2. Baptists 261
3. Quakers or Friends 265
4. Methodists 268
5. Lutherans 278
6. Universalists 280
VIII. Questions of Morals and Reform 283

CHAPTER III.

FRANCE AND OTHER ROMAN CATHOLIC COUNTRIES OF CONTINENTAL EUROPE FROM THE DEATH OF LOUIS XIV. TO THE OVERTHROW OF NAPOLEON I. (1715-1815).

I. The Political Movement in France 290
II. The Sceptical Movement 301
III. The French Church prior to the Revolution . . 318
IV. The French Church in the Revolutionary Era . 338
V. The French Church in the Napoleonic Era . . . 355
VI. Chief Events in Austria, Italy, and Spain 365

CHAPTER IV.

GERMANY AND THE NEIGHBORING PROTESTANT STATES (1720-1821).

I. General Glance at Germany 383
II. The Wolfian Era 389
III. From Kant to Schleiermacher 401
IV. Chief Events in Sweden, the Netherlands, and Switzerland 432

CHAPTER V.

THE RUSSIAN CHURCH (1725-1825) 443

THE MODERN CHURCH.

Part Second.

CHAPTER I.

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

I. — THE NONJURORS.

THE political connections of church affairs in England during the eighteenth century were so far noticed in a preceding chapter that the subject does not need to be treated in this relation. We add only a word respecting the ecclesiastical headship of the sovereign. Before the middle of the century it had come to mean little else than his having a principal voice in the dispensing of church dignities. This prerogative was not exercised at all times with equal directness. William III., after the death of Queen Mary, devolved the management of patronage upon the archbishops of Canterbury and York, and four bishops associated with them. George III. was disposed to take the matter into his own hands. Under some of the intermediate sovereigns, the ministers of State had much to do with the dispensing of patronage.

A long-enduring memorial of the political agitations which accompanied and followed the Revolution of

1688 appeared in a party of Jacobites, that commands interest on account of the unique characters which it embraced, if not on account of its principles. This party, known as the Nonjurors, consisted of men refusing to take the oath of allegiance to the new dynasty which was required of those holding clerical, academic, or other offices. While the majority of the clergy, who had been preaching non-resistance under the restored Stuarts, quieted their scruples at taking the oath by the plea that their submission, according to the example of the early Christians, was due to the government actually in power, a minority argued that mere power ought not to take precedence of justice, and that hereditary right must determine the question of allegiance. The one party claimed adherence to the sovereign *de facto*, and the other to the sovereign *de jure*.

The original Nonjurors numbered six bishops, — not including three who died before the day appointed for taking the oath, — and four hundred clergy, to whom a small fraction of the laity adhered. Their numbers, however, soon decreased. As some of the deposed prelates were fully persuaded that their own party was the only true Church in England, they proceeded to ordain bishops that the succession might be kept up, and so prepared for a perpetuation of the schism. The last in the line of the nonjuring bishops died in 1805. Aside from their position on the dynastic question, the Nonjurors were distinguished by their High Church or Anglo-Catholic principles. As we shall observe when we come to consider the Tractarian movement, recent Anglo-Catholics have recognized the kinship of this party with themselves.

Among the Nonjurors, Bishop Ken was eminent for his amiable character. Though he refused the oath himself, he passed no harsh judgment upon those who did not, and he kept aloof from Jacobite scheming. The same may be said of Robert Nelson, who is further known for his zeal in practical Christian work, and for devotional treatises that gained in their day a very wide circulation. A high rank in their party, as respects ability, was claimed by Charles Leslie and Jeremy Collier. In learning, Henry Dodwell, at one time professor of Ancient History at Oxford, stood among the foremost; but his faculties were poorly balanced, and he ran into the most extravagant fancies. George Hickes was noted for his intemperate zeal in the nonjuring cause, as also for his antiquarian labors. In the first days of the new dynasty, William Sherlock was regarded by the Nonjurors as a principal light in their midst; but he soon was convinced of the propriety of taking the oath. His former friends imputed his change of view to the devil and Mrs. Sherlock.

The most unique and the most important, in point of religious influence, among the Nonjurors was William Law. As he was not born till 1686, he belonged to the second generation of the party. The first prominent manifestation of his Jacobite bias was at Cambridge, where he was educated, and took pupils after being elected Fellow. According to his friend Byrom, in 1713, he put forward a question which showed his estimate of the plea that allegiance is due to the sovereign *de facto*. The question was this: "whether, when the children of Israel had made the golden calf the object of their worship, they ought to keep to their *God de*

facto, or return to their *God de jure*." As Queen Anne was a near descendant of the martyred Charles I., Law did not dispute her title; but on the accession of George I. he refused to take the oath of allegiance and abjuration. This of course cut off the prospect of position in the Church. A few years later he entered upon his career of authorship. In 1727 he became an inmate of the household of the grandfather of the historian Gibbon. For about twelve years he was connected with this family, being engaged a part of the time as tutor of Gibbon's father. His later years were spent in his native town, King's Cliffe, where he lived in the employ of two wealthy and pious ladies, serving as their spiritual guide and helping them in the charitable distribution of their ample income.

As a writer William Law is entitled to a place of no mean distinction. He possessed in a peculiar degree the faculty of expression, the faculty of putting his thoughts in the form and order most available for effect. Clearness, strength, and concentration upon a definite result are characteristics of nearly everything that came from his pen. F. D. Maurice speaks of him as "the most continuous writer in our language, each of his sentences and paragraphs leading on naturally, and, as it were, necessarily to that which follows."

The writings of Law reveal a strong and original bias. He stood apart from his age and in contradiction to its most marked characteristics. At a time when the prevailing conceptions of Christianity followed in the wake of Tillotson and Locke, when reasonable conduct was thought to be the whole of religion, when earnestness was at a discount, and enthusiasm was

scouted as noxious and pestilential, he looked upon religion as an all-transforming agency, linked it with the supernatural, denounced the adequacy of reason apart from divine illumination, and claimed a place for enthusiasm in piety. In fine, the mysticism into which he finally launched was only an exaggeration of the protest which from the first he was inclined to make against the cool moralizing and superficial religion of the times.

The works of Law fall into three classes, the controversial, the practical or devotional, and the mystical. To the first belong his "Letters to the Bishop of Bangor," his "Remarks on the Fable of the Bees" (an able reply to Mandeville), his "Case of Reason," against Tindal, and his "Confutation of Warburton's projected Defence." These productions contain not a little of pungent argumentation. They exhibit also the art of the skilful controversialist in their freedom from scurrilous personalities, and in the indulgence, at most, of a cutting temperateness. The mysticism of Law upon which he embarked between 1731 and 1737 appears in such writings as the "Grounds and Reasons of Christian Regeneration," the "Spirit of Love," the "Spirit of Prayer," the "Appeal to All that Doubt." The inspiration for these works was drawn from an ample acquaintance with mystical divinity. Law says of himself: "I thank God I have been a diligent reader of these mystical divines, from the apostolical Dionysius the Areopagite down to the great Fénelon, Archbishop of Cambray, the illuminated Guion, and M. Bertot." He delighted especially in mystics of the more hardy and masculine type. He was fond of Eckhart, Tauler, Suso,

Ruysbroek, and Henry Harphius; but his favorite above all others was Jacob Boehme, some of whose works he translated. Doubtless one reason of his preference for the "blessed Jacob" was the illiteracy of the man. The fact that so unlearned a man could write such rich productions was to the English mystic a most acceptable proof of the pet theory of his later years respecting the worthlessness of human learning in matters of religion. That nature is a divine theophany, that God is love, that the atonement is moral transformation by the indwelling Christ, that religion is intimate union with God, — these are the cardinal ideas in Law's mystical treatises.

While the writings just described contain passages of great beauty and spiritual depth, in real influence they can bear no comparison with the practical treatises. Law's "Christian Perfection" and "Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life" (1726–1729) took a strong hold of the more earnest minds of the age, and were prominent among the antecedents of the great revival of the eighteenth century. The latter in particular is a masterpiece of practical divinity. Its leading thought is that genuine religion cannot be made a side issue, but must rather be the vitalizing principle of the life, and rule its every part. No less a man than Samuel Johnson confessed his profound obligations to the "Serious Call." "When at Oxford," he says, "I took it up expecting to find it a dull book and perhaps to laugh at it. But I found Law quite an over-match for me; and this was the first occasion of my thinking in earnest of religion after I became capable of religious inquiry." By the same robust writer the "Serious Call" was further

described as "the finest piece of hortatory theology in any language." John Wesley also owed to it a decided religious quickening. During the latter part of his stay at Oxford, as he himself has acknowledged, Law was a "kind of oracle" to him.[1] He was at great pains to consult him, and even followed him to the extent of taking a step or two across the threshold of mysticism. Law as a mystic, however, soon became the subject of his criticism rather than of his admiration, but he continued to esteem him as an expounder of practical religion. In 1738 he acknowledged his influence on this wise: "For two years I have been preaching after the model of your two practical treatises." In the same letter, it is true, he complained of the treatises in question as more clearly showing the law than the grace of God, as pointing out the ideal rather than the means of attaining it. But this criticism, urged with some asperity, sprang from the first impulses of a new-born zeal, from the consciousness of an experience far greater than that to which he had been led by his former guide. Notwithstanding the adverse comments of the moment, he returned to a lively appreciation of Law's productions, and cordially recommended them to his people. He used the "Serious Call" as a text-book at the Kingswood school, and late in life he wrote concerning it: "It is a treatise which will hardly be excelled, if it be equalled, in the English tongue, either for beauty of expression or for justness and depth of thought." Whatever his obligations to this source may have been, it is quite certain that one cannot read the "Serious Call" and the practical teaching of Wesley, without being struck with the

[1] Journal, Sept., 1760.

numerous points of close resemblance between the two. Law, no doubt, was never an advocate of Methodism, after the Wesleyan type. He never subscribed to Wesley's technical representations about the realization of the new birth, assurance of salvation, and Christian perfection. Nevertheless there are adequate reasons for associating him with Methodism as an advocate of a piety dominating the whole life and resting upon a lively faith in the presence and immediate agency of the Holy Spirit.

William Law was pre-eminently a writer. He was not qualified for the practical work of religious leadership. His disposition tended to isolation. Wesley's capacity for close contact with men and affairs was foreign to him. But he ought to be remembered as an important contributor to the revival of the eighteenth century, and as a man whose personal piety was nurtured by an unquenchable ardor of purpose. He struggled faithfully toward his ideal and died in bright anticipation of its realization. "I feel," he exclaimed upon his dying bed, "a sacred fire kindled in my soul, which will destroy everything contrary to itself, and burn as a flame of divine love to all eternity." [1]

Before taking leave of the Nonjurors, we should notice the fact that, while the more zealous of their number looked upon their immediate neighbors as belonging to the wicked Babylon, the Eastern Church seemed to them entirely worthy of fellowship, and negotiations were entered upon (1716–1720) to test the feasibility of union or mutual recognition. The project proved to be as utopian as that entertained at the same time by a

[1] See the interesting biography of Law by J. H. Overton.

high representative of the Established Church respecting a union with the French Church.[1]

II. — THE DEISTICAL CONTROVERSY.

While the first half of the eighteenth century was the great era of the deistical controversy, the patriarch of English deism lived as early as the time of Charles I. Pained by the clash of religious opinions and the strife of sects, Lord Edward Herbert, Baron of Cherbury, set to work to find out the essential tenets of true religion. The results of his investigation and thought were expressed in several works, the principal of which were his "De Veritate" (1624), and his "De Religione Gentilium" (1645). He concluded that the essential articles of religion are the following five: 1. That there is one supreme God. 2. That He is chiefly to be worshipped. 3. That piety and virtue is the principal part of His worship. 4. That we must repent of our sins; and if we do so God will pardon them. 5. That there are rewards for good men and punishments for bad men in a future state, or, as he sometimes expresses it, both here and hereafter. The certainty of these truths he based upon reason, or intellectual intuition. Reason in all ages and the world over acknowledges

[1] The possibility of this latter scheme being broached was due to the disgust of many French theologians at the bull Unigenitus. As they were chafing under the imposition of this unholy document, Archbishop Wake received intimation that eminent doctors of the Sorbonne were willing to discuss a plan of union. A friendly correspondence ensued. "Separation from Rome was what the English archbishop chiefly pressed; 'a reformation in other matters would follow as a matter of course.'" (Abbey and Overton, History of the English Church in the Eighteenth Century.)

them. Great multitudes may have lost sight of them, but this has been owing to the misleading influence of an ambitious priestcraft. Reason left to itself discerns them and gives as great assurance of their certainty as can be given. Revelation is not specially called for, and if it were provided it would be revelation only to him to whom it might come primarily; for others it would be only history or tradition, and would leave place for doubt. Lord Herbert did not deny the possibility of revelation; indeed, he claimed himself to have received a special revelation, or a sign from heaven. As respects the Bible, he assumed that it was largely occupied with the inculcation of his list of essential tenets. Unlike some of the later deists, he does not seem to have been possessed by an irreligious bias, by a spirit of profane frivolity or fanatical spite against revealed religion. He was of a serious temper, and counted religion the most distinguishing characteristic of man. His system, however, if not professedly hostile to written revelation, tended at least to relegate it to the category of the useless.

Considerable industry was shown by Herbert in reviewing the facts of religious history; still his research was much less thorough than was needed to test his creed. As has been remarked, his five articles were not so much a legitimate résumé of beliefs which had been proved by him to be universally enforced by reason, as "precious and incomplete fragments of the Christian catechism." [1] Even among the deists themselves there were not wanting those who subsequently assailed the integrity of Herbert's symbol by casting doubt on one or more items in his list of essential truths.

[1] Édouard Sayous, Les Deistes Anglais, p. 30.

Hobbes, whose career as a writer began soon after Herbert's, is sometimes placed in the list of deistical writers; but the propriety of the classification may be questioned. With the leading tenet of Herbert and other prominent deists, that the reason of the individual may be trusted to assert the essential principles of religion, he revealed no sympathy whatever. The State, according to him, is the final authority in morals and religion; at least, he places no limitations upon the sovereignty of the State in these matters which he does not annul in one way or another. In his scheme morality is legality. "The civil laws are to all subjects the measures of their actions, whereby to determine whether they be right or wrong, profitable or unprofitable, virtuous or vicious."[1] Hobbes manifested a certain deference toward revealed religion; but evidently only in minds peculiarly constituted could his subordination of the religious to the political be held without involving the former in a species of contempt.

Charles Blount, who committed suicide in 1693, wrote in the preceding fourteen or fifteen years several works leavened with deistical teaching. His annotated translation of the first two books of Philostratus' Life of Apollonius of Tyana, was obviously designed to discredit supernatural features in the person and work of Christ, by suggesting a parallel between the narratives in the Gospels and the accounts of the heathen magician. More than one passage in the work has a Voltairean cast. Blount shows indeed in his style that he belonged to the era of Charles II. rather than to the serious age in which Herbert wrote. His circle of ideas,

[1] De Corpore Politico.

however, as appears from the "Oracles of Reason," published after his death, was much the same as that of his more earnest predecessor. No essentially new thoughts were contributed by him. "He belongs in the history of deism not as factor but as product." [1]

In 1696, a year after the publication of Locke's "Reasonableness of Christianity" appeared a work entitled "Christianity not Mysterious." Though Locke disclaimed all association with its author, the work, no doubt, had its points of contact with his philosophy in general, and with the treatise which preceded it in particular. There was an approach to paradox, however, in its form of statement which gave it a different tone from that of any production which came from the hand of the philosopher. The writer in question was John Toland, a young Irishman of liberal education, who had been brought up as a Roman Catholic, but had been converted in youth to Protestantism. His book professedly, and perhaps really, was designed to favor rather than to oppose revealed religion. He wrote evidently from the standpoint of supernaturalism, and assumed the reality of special divine communications. He maintained also that the Scriptures contain nothing which is not in harmony with reason; but at the same time he held that they contain nothing which is above reason, — no mystery proper. There is no obligation placed upon man respecting the mysterious or unintelligible. Revelation instructs; it affords new facts or truths for the consideration of reason: but it is nevertheless amenable to reason, since it cannot be truly received except as it finds a place in rational conviction.

[1] Lechler, Geschichte des Englischen Deismus, p. 127.

Toland's treatise was assailed with a storm of reprobation in his native country. "An Irish peer gave it as a reason why he had ceased to attend church, that once he heard something there about his Saviour, Jesus Christ, but now all the discourse was about one John Toland." [1] To escape imprisonment the unhappy author was obliged to leave Ireland. A few years later a paragraph in his "Life of Milton" was criticised as being an attack upon the received canon of the New Testament. The "Amyntor," which he wrote in explanation of his meaning, did not serve to clear up the subject, and a disturbance was raised which compromised his position in England. The rather intemperate opposition experienced by Toland seems to have acted upon him unfavorably, and his later works exhibit in their small regard for consistency marks of degeneracy.[2]

The writings of Shaftesbury, published under the title of "Characteristics" (1711–14), have given rise to somewhat diverse judgments on the beliefs of the author. He may be regarded as having rendered good service by opposing the artificial and utilitarian theory of morals, by maintaining that virtue is not a matter of mere convention or custom, that it has a foundation in the inherent moral constitution of man, and that it can be sought apart from rewards which appeal to self-love. It is to be noticed also that he nowhere directly challenges the truth of revealed religion. But for all this, there are sentences in his writings which naturally awaken suspicion of an unfriendly attitude toward the

[1] Hunt, Religious Thought in England.

[2] The principal of these works bear the titles "Adeisidaemon," "Nazarenus," "Tetradymus," and "Pantheisticon."

Biblical faith. "No one," says Overton, "can fail to perceive a contemptuous irony in many passages in which Shaftesbury affirms his orthodoxy, or when he touches upon the persecutions of the early Christians, or upon the sacred duty of complying with the established religion with unreasoning faith, or upon his presumed scepticism, or upon the nature of the Christian miracles, or upon the character of our blessed Saviour, or upon the representation of God in the Old Testament or upon the supposed omission of the virtue of friendship in the Christian system of ethics. The general tendency of his writings is pretty clear, and is in harmony with the deistical theory that God's revelation of himself in nature is clear and sufficient for all practical purposes, while any other revelation is uncertain, obscure, and unnecessary. But he holds that it would be unmannerly and disadvantageous to the interests of the community to act upon this doctrine in practical life."[1]

A radical attack upon the authority of Christianity came from Anthony Collins in 1724 in his "Discourse on the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion." Here the bias which he had shown in a previous work, entitled a "Discourse of Free Thinking" (1713), came to an unmistakable manifestation. Though the general proposition laid down in the earlier work was unobjectionable even in the opinion of his opponents, in its defence and illustration side-thrusts were intruded such as argued no great respect for revealed religion. The drift of the later work was to show that the proof of Christianity is founded on the fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecies, and that no fulfilment of these

[1] History of the English Church in the Eighteenth Century.

prophecies can be discovered except by wholesale recourse to type and allegory. From this it would follow of course that there is no proof of Christianity except of the most shadowy and unsubstantial nature.

It is worth while to observe that Collins, in defending his position, was led to deny that Messianic expectation was any considerable factor in Jewish thought and feeling before the coming of Christ. The contrast between this conclusion and the theory of Strauss, which makes Messianic expectation the creative force back of the gospel history, is one of the marked illustrations of disagreement in the camp of the doubters.[1]

As Collins attempted to allegorize away prophecy, so Thomas Woolston attempted to allegorize away miracles. In his study of the early fathers he became possessed with a fanatical preference for the allegorical method of interpretation. The extreme to which he carried his hobby caused him the loss of his place as Fellow at Cambridge. This drove him well nigh to madness, kindled in him a burning spite against the clergy if not against Christianity itself, and intensified his original bias to allegory. In his "Discourses on the Miracles of our Saviour," published in 1727–29, he attempted to show that the narratives of Christ's miracles, when taken in a literal sense, involve gross contradictions and absurdities, and that they must therefore be wholly viewed as types or parabolical representations of his working in the spiritual sphere. The tone of these discourses was scurrilous to the last degree. "They contain the most undisguised abuse which had been ut-

[1] Compare John Cairns, Unbelief in the Eighteenth Century as contrasted with its Earlier and Later History, pp. 78, 79.

tered against Christianity since the days of the early heathens."[1] It is not surprising, therefore, that we find Woolston subjected to fine and restricted in his liberty.

It has been concluded by some reviewers that this intemperate writer was not honest in his fanciful scheme. His turning of history into allegory they account as only a less open way of spurning Christianity altogether. And in truth there seems to be no means of avoiding this conclusion, unless an idiosyncrasy very narrowly distinguished from lunacy be ascribed to him.

Along with other miracles the resurrection of Christ was discredited by Woolston. This subject was further ventilated in a work entitled, "The Resurrection of Jesus Considered." Capital is here made out of the seeming discrepancy in the details of the gospel accounts, and the theory of intentional fraud is favored. The author, Peter Annet, who also composed some other treatises, was evidently animated by a spirit of bitter hostility to revealed religion.

In 1730 appeared one of the most important in the list of deistical works, "Christianity as old as the Creation." Matthew Tindal, the author, then in his seventieth year, had passed through a sufficient variety of theological vicissitudes, having been successively a disciple of the nonjuror Hickes, a Roman Catholic, and a Low Churchman. At the time of writing, he was, to use his own phrase, a "Christian Theist." It might be judged from the title of his work that he meant to prove the identity of revealed or Biblical religion with natural religion. But that was not his design. He aimed rather to show that natural religion, or that dictated by

[1] A. S. Farrar, Critical History of Free Thought, p. 137.

man's reason, is in itself perfect, and that the Christian religion, or any other, is a true religion only so far as it is identical with the natural. He argued that God in His immutability and benevolence can be supposed to give only such laws as correspond to the fixed relations of men to Himself and to each other, that He would give only a perfect code, and that accordingly change or addition cannot be admitted without challenging the divine perfections. As respects the Scriptures, he indicated plainly enough that he regarded them as in part contradictory to natural religion, and, on the whole, quite as much a hindrance as a help to the ascertainment of the truth.

Tindal's natural religion, complete and unchanging, was manifestly a scholastic conceit. Its air of plausibility vanishes at once when one descends from the region of abstraction and considers men as they appear in authentic history. Abundant facts make it plain that the simple reason of mankind has been far from giving outright a complete stock of religious ideas, so as to leave no demand for the tuition and development which are supposed in a process of revelation.

Thomas Morgan, whose "Moral Philosopher" appeared in 1737–40, stepped aside from average deism in the stress which he placed upon the immanence or immediate action of Deity. His most characteristic trait, however, was his Gnostic antipathy to Judaism, or his disposition to interpose a very wide chasm between the Old and the New Testament. In accordance with this feature, he had a special regard for Paul among New Testament writers, reckoning him as the great free-thinker of his century, who rendered a most

important service in opposing the Judaizers. His conception of the relation of Paul to the other apostles was not unlike that which more recently has been advocated by Baur and other representatives of the Tübingen school.

At the same time that Morgan was attracting attention, Thomas Chubb, a self-educated man from the laboring class, made his first considerable contribution to the deistic literature, his "True Gospel of Jesus Christ" being published in 1738. At this date his conception of Christ's person was of the Socinian order, and in His gospel he saw simply a republication of a pure ethical code. In his later writings he showed a more pronounced aversion to the supposition of any supernatural elements in the life of Christ, and also discredited the doctrine of special providence.

Bolingbroke, a striking example of the sceptical aristocrat and voluptuary, reserved his writings upon religion to be published after his death. They appeared in 1754. The method of Bolingbroke was preeminently historical. He wished to bring everything to the test of experience, and affected to despise speculation. Philosophers no less than theologians he regarded as the grand corrupters of truth. He believed in a God, but disbelieved in His direct control of the world after the work of creation. He held a contemptuous view of human nature, and doubted man's immortality. The Old Testament he treated with as much virulence as did Morgan. He praised the moral teachings of the Gospels, but denied the miracles, and claimed that the New Testament writers made corrupting additions to the teachings of Christ. "Boling-

broke," says Lecky, "is a great name in politics, but the pretentious and verbose inanity of his theological writings fully justifies the criticism, 'leaves without fruit,' which Voltaire is said to have applied to his style."

We have passed by Mandeville's "Fable of the Bees," a work calculated to confuse moral distinctions, but not specially in the deistical vein, as also "Christianity not founded upon Argument," by Henry Dodwell, Jr., a treatise professedly in favor of an unreasoning faith wrought in the heart by the direct agency of the Spirit, but probably intended to discredit revealed religion. Bolingbroke stands at the end of the great deistical era. Hume, who was known as a writer in the later years of Bolingbroke, in his radical scepticism went beyond and outside of deism, while Gibbon and Paine as belonging to the closing quarter of the eighteenth century were separated by an interval from the preceding list of deists.

It is to be noticed of this school of sceptics that they appear in contrast with more recent doubters, in that they drew their premises from reason and history, and scarcely at all from the domain of physical science. "Nearly all the early members of the Royal Society, nearly all the first teachers of the Newtonian philosophy, were ardent believers in revelation." [1] As respects metaphysical tenets, the deists in general were not widely distinguished from their opponents. Locke was very largely the oracle of both parties.

The deistical writings called forth an immense literary activity from the friends of revealed religion. To every noteworthy attack an extended response was

[1] Lecky, History of England in the Eighteenth Century, ii. 572.

made. Collins' principal work elicited thirty-five replies within two years. Woolston's attack on miracles received within a brief space about sixty replies. Tindal's work was honored with one hundred and fifteen answers. Some of these productions, to be sure, were only brief essays, but others were of the nature of elaborate apologies.

Among the more noteworthy replies to the attacks of the deists, the following may be named: Lardner's "Credibility of the Gospel History;" Bentley's "Phileleutherus Lipsiensis," in reply to Collins on Free Thinking; Edward Chandler's "Defence of Christianity from the Prophecies of the Old Testament;" Samuel Chandler's "Vindication of the Christian Religion" (against Collins); Thomas Sherlock's "Use and Intent of Prophecy," also his noted treatise, "The Tryal of the Witnesses of the Resurrection of Jesus;" Zachary Pearce's "Miracles of Jesus Vindicated;" Richard Smalbrooke's "Vindication of Our Savior's Miracles;" William Law's "Case of Reason" (against Tindal); James Foster's "Usefulness, Truth, and Excellency of the Christian Revelation;" John Conybeare's "Defence of Revealed Religion;" Bishop Butler's "Analogy" (1736); John Chapman's "Eusebius" (against Morgan); William Warburton's "Divine Legation of Moses Demonstrated," also his "View of Lord Bolingbroke's Philosophy;" John Leland's general work entitled "A View of the Principal Deistical Writers," besides several specific treatises from his pen.

While the ability and aptness of these replies were not the sole causes that drove the deistical writings

into comparative neglect on English soil by the middle of the century, they may be credited in some measure with this result. No doubt there was a failure in many instances to employ the best arts of defence. Especially must this be allowed if regard be had to a truly valid and permanent vindication of Christianity. A disproportionate stress was placed upon external as compared with internal evidences. The historical factor in revelation, or its necessary dependence upon conditions that could be realized only through a lengthened progress, was not duly considered. The extent to which the Biblical writings transcend the mere office of instruction, and present truth in such form and connections as to make it a power over heart and conscience, was inadequately emphasized. Miracles were viewed too exclusively as mere supports of revelation, instead of being included among the means of revelation; moreover, the supreme marvel of sacred history, the great moral miracle of the gospel, the unique and holy character of Jesus Christ, was not lifted into suitable prominence. Nevertheless, much good work was done in offsetting deistic argumentation or insinuation. Butler's "Analogy," in whatever degree it may fail to meet more recent types of scepticism, was in its whole texture an apt response to the contemporary deists. This has been acknowledged by John Stuart Mill. "The argument of Butler's 'Analogy,'" he says, "is, from its own point of view, conclusive; the Christian religion is open to no objections, either moral or intellectual, which do not apply at least equally to the common theory of deism."[1] With others of the apologists

[1] Essays on Religion.

also we find not only indications of careful research, but likewise of an excellent insight into some of the main aspects of the subjects under review. For example, the necessity of taking Christian evidences in their general scope and proper connection is thus asserted by Zachary Pearce: "There is no proposition in Euclid or Newton, though never so strictly demonstrable, but will lose all its force of conviction if a man begins at the wrong end, disjoints the several parts of the proof, or places them in a wrong or unnatural order. It is the same thing in Christianity. If a man singles out a miracle or a prophecy, and having exposed, as artfully as he can, the literal story of either, if from thence he forms an argument that these do not prove Jesus to have come from God, or to have been the Messiah, he may to weak understandings seem to say something material, and may triumph in the quaintness of his objections; for, no doubt, *every* miracle of Christ singly considered does not infallibly prove His divine mission, nor does *every* prophecy, singly considered, point Him out for the true Messiah. Exceptions may be drawn from the circumstances of some of them by men disposed to cavil. But all this while truth is truth, and would appear so if the proofs were pursued in their natural order."[1] James Foster finds in the like consideration a ground for a normal estimate of the gospel miracles. "In my opinion," he writes, "it is not rational to suppose that miracles *alone*, and apart from all other considerations, are an absolute and decisive proof of the truth and divinity of any revelation, but considered with all their circumstances;

[1] The Miracles of Jesus Vindicated, part i.

either as they attest a wise and holy doctrine,— a doctrine worthy of God, calculated to promote the moral perfection and happiness of mankind, and wisely suited to the condition and necessities of those for whose use it is particularly designed; or else, as they are friendly and beneficent miracles, and bear upon them the strongest characters of wisdom and goodness, as well as power; and consequently cannot, without the utmost absurdity and most manifest contradiction to the nature of things, be looked upon as the operations of evil spirits."[1] The answer which John Leland returns to the fundamental objection of deism against a positive religion, namely, that it lacks the requisite characteristic of universality, will strike most as well put. "The asserters of the Christian revelation," he says, "are under no obligations to limit God's universal benevolence. They leave those that are destitute of this revelation to God's infinite mercy; and can think more favorably of their case than those consistently can do who will not allow that they were under any great darkness, and suppose them to have acted in manifest opposition to the most clear universal light. . . . If all men everywhere were required actually to believe that revelation, and were condemned for not believing it, it would be necessary to have it universally promulgated. But since the actual believing of it is required of those only to whom it is actually published, and they to whom it is not made known are not put into a worse condition than if there had been no such revelation granted at all, no argument can be

[1] The Usefulness, Truth, and Excellency of the Christian Revelation Defended, pp. 51, 52.

brought to show that it is inconsistent with the divine wisdom and goodness to grant such a revelation to some part of mankind, though it be not actually promulgated to the whole human race, especially if in its own nature and original intention it was fitted and designed to be of universal extent, which is the case of the Christian revelation."[1] Conybeare meets the deists with no small degree of tact, in that he both honors the function of reason and shows that it does not preclude the utility of revelation. Two or three extracts will sufficiently illustrate his position. "It is an over-pious strain of some good men," he remarks, "who assert that we must deny our reason in matters of religion; and that doctrines, however apparently absurd, must be received when recommended under that sacred name. Those who maintain this position do not consider that they do at the same time overthrow the very foundations of religion. For, beside that it is in itself impossible that a man should be persuaded of the truth of a proposition which he at the same time believes to be absurd, such a denying our reason in one point (were it possible) must destroy the use of it in all others. If a man should be satisfied of the truth of a proposition which appears to him to be absurd, he might as well be satisfied of the falsehood of a proposition which appears to him to be demonstrable. Upon this supposition no arguments can be urged on which securely to build our faith. . . . There is hardly any one point in morality which does not admit of various degrees of clearness in different periods of life. The very same man must perceive things in different lights

[1] A View of the Principal Deistical Writers, i. 32–35.

as experience and study shall open his mind and gradually improve his reason. Can any one affirm that he had the same view of every point of morality when he first employed his thoughts about it, which he afterwards had, upon increase of years, and a maturity of consideration? But if some things are capable of becoming more clear by an advantageous change of circumstances, then 't is certain that they are not absolutely clear to all; and every man who doth but reflect a little on his own gradual progress in moral wisdom and knowledge, must be conscious of this truth. . . . Suppose a question should arise whether every man be capable of mastering the several arts and sciences without a teacher; and it were alleged that every one must be capable of this, or else he would be unable to judge whether his master should teach him right or wrong, and consequently such teaching could be of no service to him. Would such arguing as this be admitted? No, certainly; and for this reason, namely, that things which might not be known, or perhaps knowable, without teaching, may yet immediately approve themselves to the mind when taught. In like manner, things which could not be discovered without a revelation may yet, upon that revelation, appear so plainly agreeable with reason that a man may not entertain the least doubt whether they are capable of being true or no."[1] Conybeare wrote with special reference to Tindal's ill-disguised attempt to prove revelation both needless and impossible. The following passage from William Law, aimed against the same deistical author, is also worth

[1] The Credibility of the Mysteries of the Christian Religion; a Defence of Revealed Religion against the Exceptions of a late Writer.

quoting: "Had mankind continued in a state of perfect innocence, without ever failing in their duty either to God or man, yet even in such a state they could never have known what God would, or would not, reveal to them, but by some express revelation from Him. And, as God might intend to raise them to some higher and unknown state of perfection, so He might raise them to it by the revelation of such things as their own reason, though innocent and incorrupt, yet could not have discovered. But if man in a state of innocence could have no pretence to set himself against divine revelation, and make his own reason the final judge of what God could, or could not, reveal to him, much less has he any pretence for so doing in his present state of sin, ignorance, and misery. His nature and condition is so far from furnishing him with reasons against revelation, against any supernatural help from God, that it seems to be inconsolable without it." [1]

III.—THE MORAL AND RELIGIOUS CONDITION OF ENGLAND ON THE EVE OF THE GREAT REVIVAL.

If we add the names of Bishop Berkeley and some others to the list of apologists contained in the preceding section, a majority of whom belonged to the Established Church, we shall see that the English Church in the first half of the eighteenth century, could claim no little merit on the score of intellectual strength and activity. Had it been equally eminent in respect of practical religion, it might well be proud of its record

[1] The Case of Reason or Natural Religion fully stated.

in that era. But unhappily, the reverse was the case. It was a time of unusual spiritual barrenness. The Church failed of the true aggressive impulse and power against ungodliness. Some of the bishops who shone as great lights in the controversial field did very little to promote the interests of practical religion within the sphere of their superintendence. According to Burnet, many of those who aspired to the ministry were ignorant of the first principles of evangelical truth. "The much greater part," he writes, "of those who come to be ordained are ignorant to a degree not to be apprehended by those who are not obliged to know it. The easiest part of knowledge is that to which they are the greatest strangers; I mean the plainest parts of the Scriptures. They can give no account, or at least a very imperfect one, of the contents of the Gospels, or of the catechism itself." The style of preaching most in vogue was singularly inadequate to lay hold upon heart and conscience with transforming effect. Reaction against the fervors of the commonwealth era had begotten a horror of anything approaching to enthusiasm. "Appeals both to authority and to the stronger passions gradually ceased. The more doctrinal aspects of religion were softened or suffered silently to recede, and, before the eighteenth century had much advanced, sermons had generally become mere moral essays, characterized chiefly by cold good sense, and appealing almost exclusively to prudential motives."[1] In 1724 Bishop Gibson thought it necessary to remind his clergy of their "being Christian preachers and not mere preachers of morality," and in 1735 Hearne com-

[1] Lecky, History of England in the Eighteenth Century, i. 92.

plained that "the misfortune now-a-days is that the sermons are more like essays than sermons, as having little of Scripture and divinity in them." An excessive utilitarianism pervaded all kinds of religious writing. Happiness was glorified in sermons, essays, and theological treatises, as the goal of ambition and expectation, "our being's end and aim." With a part of the clergy there was an undisguised dislike and repudiation of some of the cardinal features of evangelical Protestantism. "Certain doctrines taught in common by the reformers and later divines in the English Church were caricatured and denounced, especially the doctrine of justification by faith, which was represented as a doctrine *against* good works. Miracles were appealed to as the seals of Christianity in the first century; but the work of the Holy Spirit on the souls of men in the eighteenth was pronounced an idle dream." [1]

The age, in general, as if taking its impress from the prosaic empirical philosophy which was dominant, was peculiarly lacking in warmth of feeling and in appreciation for the mystical side of man and the universe. "Never," says James Hamilton, "has century risen on England so void of soul and faith as that which opened with Queen Anne, and which found its misty noon beneath the second George." These characteristics were revealed in the poet as well as in the preacher. Pope was the great luminary in the domain of the muses. Poetry was distinguished by considerable liveliness of fancy, by nicety of versification, and by polish

[1] Stoughton, History of Religion in England, Georgian era, pp. 44, 45.

of expression, but was greatly lacking in emotional depth and spiritual suggestiveness.

The peculiar bias of the age may not have been without a certain advantage. The aversion to enthusiasm tended, in some measure, to place a check upon superstition. A special manifestation of this tendency may perhaps be discerned in the relaxation, in 1736, of the law against witchcraft. Toleration also stood a better chance to get a foothold at such a time, other things being equal, than in an age of intense unrelaxed zeal. There was, it is true, a plenty of intolerant outbursts, yet the cause of toleration, especially after the reign of Anne, was gaining ground.

On the other hand, there were disadvantages of a very serious nature. The absence in the Church and in the spirit of the age of sanctified zeal and spiritual depth left a considerable fraction of the nation an easy prey to a flippant and scornful infidelity. "It has come," said Bishop Butler, "I know not how, to be taken for granted by many persons that Christianity is not so much as a subject for inquiry, but that it is now at length discovered to be fictitious." Archbishop Secker wrote to the same effect: "In this we cannot be mistaken, that an open and professed disregard of religion is become, through a variety of unhappy causes, the distinguishing character of the present age."

In morals the lapse was even more conspicuous. The first half of the eighteenth century added another to the list of demonstrations that good moralizing is far from necessarily implying good morals. In the lack of an adequate motive power, immorality was feebly

withstood, and it went on with a widening, deepening current till near the middle of the century. Even such a counter influence as the sanctified learning and wit of the great essayists, like Addison and Steele, seems to have effected little toward checking the adverse drift. The clergy as a body were not notoriously corrupt, but instances of scandal were uncomfortably frequent, and non-residence and pluralities were abuses too common to be generally regarded as scandalous. In fashionable and political life there was no small degree of unblushing baseness. The court of the first two Georges was scarcely cleaner than that of Charles II. Richard Walpole, who had a chief control of the administration for a long period, was a statesman of the expediency stripe, whose great object was to keep things quiet by any and every means, who encouraged venality on all sides, and who was withal an adept in foul language, and a devotee of the bottle, the table, and the chase. Bolingbroke, the brilliant orator, filled up his earlier years with licentious excess, and his later with political intrigue,—a man who could loudly champion the cause of the High Church party, and stigmatize free-thinkers as pests of society, while yet he was himself one of the most radical and cold-blooded among the free-thinkers of his age. Chesterfield, the ornament of polite society, in his correspondence with his son, made elaborate endeavors to convince him that polish is of more importance than principle, and remorselessly filled out the curriculum of a genteel education by instructing him in the arts of seduction. Such was the example of some of the leaders. Many were the apt pupils. Though moderation was the watchword in

religion, moderation in living was little regarded. Gambling and extravagance were rife. A large proportion of families were disposed to overstep the limits of their incomes. The prisons swarmed with incompetent debtors. With this fashionable extravagance was joined, at least in the early Georgian era, a peculiar vein of coarseness. Walter Scott, in the time of George III., wrote: "We should do great injustice to the present day by comparing our manners with those of the reign of George I. The writings even of the most esteemed poets of that period contain passages which now would be accounted to deserve the pillory. Nor was the tone of conversation more pure than of composition; for the taint of Charles II.'s reign continued to infect society until the present reign, when, if not more moral, we are at least more decent." Commerce, which has its diabolical phases in every age, included in this period some items of peculiar enormity. Up to the middle of the century a flourishing slave-trade went on, with scarcely an opposing voice to challenge the iniquity. "It has been computed that between 1680 and 1700 the English tore from Africa about 300,000 negroes, or about 15,000 every year. In a discussion upon the methods of making the trade more effectual, which took place in the English Parliament in 1750, it was shown that 46,000 negroes were at this time annually sold to the English colonies alone."[1]

As respects the mass of the people, they were left to a lamentable degree under the dominion of ignorance and brutality. "The increase of population which

[1] Lecky, ii. 13, 14.

followed on the growth of towns and the development of commerce had been met by no effort for their religious or educational improvement. Not a new parish had been created. Hardly a single new church had been built."[1] Drunkenness in particular was a source of misery and degradation. A demand for the stronger liquors increased in geometrical ratio. While statistics report British spirits distilled in 1684 at 527,000 gallons, they report for 1735 no less than 5,394,000 gallons. "Physicians declared that in excessive gin-drinking a new and terrible source of mortality had been opened for the poor. The grand jury of Middlesex declared that much the greater part of the poverty, the murders, the robberies of London, might be traced to this single cause. Retailers of gin were accustomed to hang out painted boards announcing that their customers could be made drunk for a penny, and dead drunk for two pence, and should have straw for nothing."[2]

Evidently there was a profound demand for a new moral and spiritual factor in the Church and society of England. The fulness of time had come for the Great Revival. That revival, if it did not reform all that needed to be reformed, cast nevertheless a new leaven into Church and society, checked an on-going declension, and emancipated a great multitude from a degrading enslavement to vice.

[1] Green, History of the English People, iv. 121.
[2] Lecky, i. 519.

IV.—THE GREAT REVIVAL.

A simultaneous awakening in different quarters was a striking characteristic of the Reformation in the sixteenth century. Though the trumpet blast of a Luther reverberated with most far-reaching and startling effect, there were others who, independently of him, sounded the proclamation of religious emancipation. A kindred fire began to burn about the same time in Wittenberg, in Einsiedeln and Zurich, in Paris and Meaux, at Cambridge, and Oxford. Something analogous appeared in the second quarter of the eighteenth century. Near the end of 1734 the first stage of the great New England revival was inaugurated, under Jonathan Edwards, at Northampton. A year or two later the spirited preaching of Howell Harris, Daniel Rolands, and Howell Davies started an awakening in different parts of Wales. In the spring of 1742 Cambuslang, Kilsyth, and other Scottish towns witnessed a remarkable outburst of religious interest.[1] These movements in different quarters may be taken as indications of the stirrings of a common Spirit, tokens of the march of Divine Providence toward an era of extensive reform. In 1739 a work was set on foot in England which was destined to supplement all the other movements instanced above, and to appear indeed as the grand central factor of the revival era. The more prominent agents of this work were John Wesley, Charles Wesley, and George Whitefield, though a

[1] Whitefield, it is true, had been to Scotland shortly before; but the local pastors had laid the foundation for the revival, and its beginning occurred under their auspices while Whitefield was in England.

host of others served as the indispensable instruments of its advance.

1. BEGINNINGS OF METHODISM. — John Wesley, the senior of Charles by about five years, was born at the rectory of Epworth, in 1703. He was one of nineteen children, the majority of whom, however, died in childhood. His parents were both of the stanch independent, conscientious type. The father, Samuel, had secured his education at Oxford by his own industry and energy, and had become a prolific, if not a very successful writer, in addition to his diligent discharge of pastoral duties. The mother, Susanna, the daughter of an eminent Nonconformist minister, was a woman who mingled unusual intellectual alertness and strength with deep piety, who conducted in person the early education of her children, who believed in strict family government, but yet mixed therewith so much of good sense and kindness as to earn the fervent affection and gratitude of her children. John deferred to her judgment even in the maturity of his years, and regarded her as realizing almost the ideal of womanhood.

When between ten and eleven years of age, John was sent to the Charterhouse school in London, where he remained till he was sixteen. From 1720 to 1725 he was connected with Christ Church at Oxford. As a collegian he exhibited, what was a life-long characteristic, a marked ease and readiness of acquisition. Isaac Taylor speaks of him as almost intuitively master of all arts except the highest, by which he means that of the philosopher.[1] What he might have accomplished in this art was not fully to appear; for his absorbing

[1] Wesley and Methodism.

devotion to practical labors precluded that steady and long-continued reflection which are essential to any great achievements in speculative philosophy.

During this period of school life John was religious only in a very moderate sense, and declined rather than advanced in that sensibility of heart which had characterized his early childhood. At the same time he held to the form, and did not wholly lay aside the purpose of religion. But serious considerations were awakened in his mind as he began to contemplate the ministerial office. His standard of piety was also greatly exalted by the careful perusal at this juncture of Kempis' "Imitation of Christ," and Jeremy Taylor's "Holy Living," and "Holy Dying." To be sure, he took some exceptions to these productions, complaining of the excessive asceticism of Kempis, and of Taylor's denial of assurance to the believer. Nevertheless, his heart was profoundly moved. Referring to impressions made by these works, he afterwards wrote: "I saw that giving even all my life to God would profit me nothing unless I gave my heart, yea all my heart to Him. I saw that simplicity of intention, and purity of affection, one design in all that we speak and do, and one desire ruling all our tempers, are indeed the wings of the soul, without which she can never ascend to God. . . . Instantly I resolved to dedicate all my life to God, all my thoughts and words and actions,— being thoroughly convinced that there was no medium; but that every part of my life, not some only, must either be a sacrifice to God, or myself,— that is, in effect, the devil." A little later his thirst after entire conformity to God was not a little intensified by reading the stir-

ring treatises of William Law. Meanwhile he had entered into orders, being ordained deacon in September, 1725. He continued, however, his connection with Oxford. In March, 1726, he was elected Fellow of Lincoln College, and in November of the same year, although at that time but twenty-three years of age, was chosen Greek lecturer and moderator of the classes. From the middle of 1727 to the latter part of 1729 he was mainly engaged as his father's curate at Epworth and Wroote.

During this last interval the germ of an important movement had appeared at Oxford. Of this, Charles Wesley, who entered Christ Church in 1726, gives the following account: "My first year at college I lost in diversions; the next I set myself to study. Diligence led me into serious thinking. I went to the weekly sacrament and persuaded two or three young students to accompany me, and to observe the method of study prescribed by the statutes of the University. This gained for me the harmless name of Methodist." Such was the first application of this term in the connection to which modern usage has assigned it, though it was not the first instance of its use in England in ecclesiastical relations. It had been thrown out as a term of reproach against various parties in the preceding century. On the arrival of John Wesley, in 1729, as tutor in Lincoln College, he was at once installed as the leader of the initial society, and it assumed a more definite form. At first it consisted of four members,—the two Wesleys, William Morgan, and Robert Kirkham. Among the later additions the more noteworthy were Benjamin Ingham, James Gambold, Thomas Broughton,

John Clayton, James Hervey, and George Whitefield, the last of whom joined in 1735, near the close of the Wesleys' stay at Oxford. In the first instance, their scheme embraced, besides frequent attendance on the Lord's Supper, the employment of several evenings of the week in reading together the Greek Testament and the classics, and the dedication of Sunday evening to the study of divinity. To this there were soon added a comprehensive system of self-examination, the visiting of the prisoners and the sick, and the practice of contributing to the poor all of their incomes in excess of necessary expenses, and of fasting Wednesdays and Fridays,— a kind of life which earned for them from their many bitter and scurrilous opponents such titles as the Reforming Club, the Godly Club, the Holy Club, Sacramentarians, Bible Moths, Supererogation Men, and Enthusiasts. Some of these terms were not altogether inappropriate. They had in truth something of the disposition of the typical sacramentalist. They accredited much authority to Christian antiquity, and were scrupulous upon points of ceremonial. In these respects, as well as in their ascetic bias, they prefigured to some extent the Ritualistic party of the present century. Says Tyerman: "With the exception of sacerdotal millinery, the burning of incense, the worship of the Virgin, prayers for the dead, and two or three other kindred superstitions, the Oxford Methodists were the predecessors of the present Ritualistic party of the Church of England."[1] It should be stated, however, in justice, that, in wide distinction from the later Ritualists, they were conscious of no hostility to

[1] Oxford Methodists.

the leading doctrines of Protestantism, and cast no reverential, longing glances toward the Church of Rome, which indeed they regarded as the temple of Antichrist. It must be allowed, moreover, that the régime of the Oxford Club, though representing an inferior stage of piety, and lacking the breath of the evangelical life and power which afterwards kindled an invincible and contagious energy in some of its representatives, was not without its advantages. It gave a valuable schooling in self-denial, in practical benevolence, and in the hardihood which preserves a calm and cheerful mien in the midst of opprobrium and scorn.

A few words may be said here respecting the after-life of some of the Oxford Club, whom it will not be convenient to recall again. Kirkham retired to a curacy in 1731, and his further history remains in obscurity. Morgan died in 1732. Clayton, the most ritualistic of the Oxford group, carried into his parish work at Manchester the same zeal which had distinguished him at the University; but when Methodism ran into the irregularity of an out-door evangelism he withheld from it his countenance and friendship. Ingham, a companion of Wesley in Georgia, as also in his German tour, became at an early date an out-door evangelist, and labored successfully in the North of England. The resulting societies he held for a time in connection with the Moravians, but finally disengaged them from this relation, and, in providing them with sacramental services of their own, virtually effected a separation from the Established Church. His later years were imbittered by the disrupting work which the

Sandemanian heresy wrought in his societies. Ingham was happily married to Lady Margaret Hastings, a most devout and worthy woman. Her testimony that, after she had found the grace of Christ, she had been as happy as an angel, was a principal means in converting the noble countess, Selina Huntingdon, who figured so prominently in the history of Calvinistic Methodism. Gambold became permanently identified with the Moravians, acquired among them the episcopal rank, and preached to their societies in London with eloquence and power. Hervey was distinguished, apart from his pastoral labors, by his productiveness as a writer. Among his works, the most elaborate was his "Theron and Aspasio," in which a theological teaching moderately Calvinistic is relieved by a plentiful intermixture of scene-painting. He was of a contemplative turn, and "his mission," as one has described it, "was to sanctify the sentimentalism of the day." Modern taste would hardly be pleased with these writings. "Hervey's style," says Overton, "can be described in no meaner terms than as the extra-superfine style. It is prose run mad." Nevertheless, it was well suited for immediate effect. The works of Hervey had for the time being an immense circulation. Broughton, as secretary of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, rendered valuable service in the distribution of Christian literature.

While the members of the Oxford Club practised an ascetic type of piety, they were far from proscribing cheerfulness or advocating moroseness. Clear testimony is given that this was the case with their leader. Gambold informs us that Wesley at Oxford was always

cheerful; and Wesley himself, writing from Georgia as a representative of the same class of views which he had cherished at the University, gave expression to sentiments like this: "I am convinced that religion has nothing sour, austere, unsociable, unfriendly in it; but, on the contrary, implies the most winning sweetness, the most amiable softness and gentleness."

Another letter which Wesley wrote from Georgia gives interesting evidence on a peculiar phase of his theological development during the later years of his stay at Oxford. In 1732, by the advice of William Law, he began to read the "Theologia Germanica," and other mystical works. It would appear from his communication to his brother Samuel that for a time he was strongly attracted by the mystical theology. He writes: "I think the rock on which I had nearest made shipwreck of the faith was the writings of the mystics." Wesley, however, seems to have been cured of his leaning in this direction as early as his departure from Oxford. Thereafter his references to the mystics were, in the main, far from flattering, being sharpened, no doubt, by the consciousness of the perilous attraction which they had formerly exercised over him. We find him declaring that he found it absolutely necessary to surrender either the mystics or the Bible. While he allows that they have said many excellent things, and have scattered some light in the midst of Romish darkness, he complains that they are utterly lacking in uniformity, and exhibit as many religions as they have produced books. In connection with a later perusal of the "Theologia Germanica," he exclaims: "Oh, how was it that I could ever so admire

the affected obscurity of this unscriptural writer?"[1] Law's preference for Boehme he pronounces extremely ridiculous, and sarcastically suggests that he is rendering poor service to the German dreamer by dragging him out of his awful obscurity, and pouring light upon his venerable darkness, since the darker the well is, the deeper it is apt to be imagined.[2] He styles Boehme an ingenious madman, who over and over again contradicts Christian experience, reason, Scripture, and himself,[3] and says of his "Mysterium Magnum, or Exposition of Genesis," "It is most sublime nonsense, inimitable bombast, fustian not to be paralleled."[4] Madam Guyon and Fénelon he estimates much more favorably, but thinks that their opinions must be taken with a large discount. Swedenborg was regarded by him as a mild lunatic. "I cannot but think," he says, "the fever he had twenty years ago, when he supposes he was introduced into the society of angels, really introduced him into the society of lunatics. . . . From that time he was exactly in the state of that gentleman at Argos,—

> 'Who wondrous tragedies was wont to hear,
> Sitting alone in the empty theatre.'"[5]

Wesley's attraction toward mysticism testifies to the deep thirst and anxious inquiries of his heart after the pathway of spiritual life, while his speedy emancipation from the same shows that it was not really agreeable to his mental constitution. No man was ever

[1] Journal, Nov., 1741.
[2] Letter to the Rev. Mr. Law.
[3] Journal, July, 1773.
[4] Journal, June, 1742.
[5] Journal, Dec., 1771; April, 1779.

more wedded to the love of transparent clearness. Mysticism, to be sure, in the broadest sense, might include the final system of Wesley, as being an emphatic specimen of subjective supernatural religion; but the mysticism which either disparages outward means of nurturing piety, or passes off into speculative vagueness, failed utterly to claim any place in his permanent regard. Indeed his transient esteem for the mystical writings was probably due simply to the vein of fervent, soaring piety which they contained. Among the benefits which he derived from this source may be placed a check upon his excessive regard for the authority of Christian antiquity; such, at least, is the import of his own statements.

From Oxford we follow the Methodist chiefs to America. In 1735 Oglethorpe started for Georgia, with a reinforcement for the colony which he had recently planted there. Among those accompanying him were a small party of Moravians, with their bishop, David Nitschmann, the two Wesleys, and Ingham. It was by the earnest solicitation of Oglethorpe and the trustees of the Georgian colony that John Wesley was persuaded to embark. His expectation was to labor as a missionary among the Indians; but in this he was disappointed. His sojourn was confined to the colony, and was none too pleasant at that. Like most new settlements, the Georgian, while it contained some excellent elements, included others of an unstable and refractory nature. Trouble was soon made for the Oxfordists. Charles Wesley was assailed with such a vexatious opposition that he remained but little over five months. John stayed less than two years, and left

under circumstances the reverse of flattering. A part of his trouble, no doubt, may safely be charged to his own indiscretion. A rigid High Church scheme could not easily be fitted to a mixed colony; yet such was the scheme which John Wesley sought to carry through with unfaltering perseverance. "He had early, and also forenoon service every day. He divided the morning service, taking the Litany as a separate service; he inculcated fasting and confession, and weekly communion; he refused the Lord's Supper to all who had not been episcopally baptized; he insisted on baptism by immersion; he rebaptized the children of dissenters; and he refused to bury all who had not received Episcopalian baptism."[1] Wesley himself, at a later period, after receiving a beautiful Christian letter from one to whom he had denied the communion on the ground of irregular baptism, remarked upon his former procedure: "Can any one carry High Church zeal higher than this? And how well have I since been beaten with mine own staff!"[2] Finally, matters were brought to a crisis by his exclusion from the communion of a certain woman who failed to meet the conditions he had imposed. This woman, known as Miss Hopkey before her marriage, had commended herself to Wesley by her apparent religious zeal, had nursed him with sympathetic attention during an illness, and had won his warm attachment. He wished to make her his wife, but the adverse counsel of those to whom he submitted the case dissuaded him from the design, or at least inclined him to delay in the matter. Meanwhile the young lady suddenly married a Mr. William-

[1] J. H. Rigg, The Living Wesley.

[2] Journal, Sept., 1749.

son. Not unnaturally, therefore, but probably with entire injustice, Wesley's exclusion of her from the sacrament was imputed to unworthy motives. Her friends, including the chief magistrate of Savannah, a man of lax principle, carried the matter into court. An unprincipled persecution of the conscientious, if mistaken, minister was undertaken, and Wesley, seeing no hope of a favorable issue, determined to leave the colony. In the early part of 1738 he was back again in England. A record of failure surely is this chapter in Wesley's history! Not altogether. He had passed through a valuable discipline and made acquisitions of great moment. He had become acquainted with the Moravians, had admired their Christian meekness, and been made inquisitive as to the cause of their fearlessness in the presence of threatened shipwreck. The practical demand for communicating with different nationalities had given him more or less of an introduction to three of the European languages, — the German, the Spanish, and the Italian. Moreover, according to Whitefield, who followed him in this field, his labors had not been void of benefit to the colonists. Whitefield's testimony is as follows: "The good that Mr. John Wesley has done in America is inexpressible. His name is very precious among the people; and he has laid a foundation that I hope neither men nor devils will ever be able to shake."

Whatever the religious condition of John Wesley may have been at this stage, it was certainly remote from pharisaic self-satisfaction. "It is upwards of two years," he wrote, "since I left my native country, in order to teach the Georgia Indians the nature of Chris-

tianity; but what have I learned myself in the meantime? Why (what I least of all suspected), that I, who went to America to convert others, was never converted myself." He declared, moreover, that he found his own heart altogether corrupt and abominable, and his faith destitute of any saving quality. This, no doubt, was over-drawn. Wesley sadly needed the experience of evangelical freedom and power; but this does not imply that the earnest, it might be called heroic, consecration which he had maintained for years was worthless. At a later date he himself judged more mildly, and accredited to his former state the faith of a *servant*, as distinguished from that of a *son*. According to a sermon of his, one having the genuine faith of a servant is not to be accounted under the wrath of God.

However much of the imperative mood characteristic of leadership may have belonged to John Wesley, he was certainly at this stage very ready to accept guidance. His earnestness and distress made him eager to be instructed by any one who could afford genuine light. In this spirit, directly after his arrival in England, he communicated with the Moravian society then recently established in London, and put himself under the instruction of the eminent Moravian Peter Boehler. His new guide pointed away from the round of self-denying duties, as a ground of confidence or adequate instrument of religious progress, and directed him to the faith which works with the energy of a supernatural power, leading to speedy renewal of the heart and assurance of salvation. Wesley, finding his objections answered, and the views that were commended

accordant with Scripture, gave himself earnestly to the pursuit of the experience to which Boehler's instructions pointed. On the 24th of May, 1738, he found the object of his desire; the coveted assurance was received, and a fire destined to light a kindred flame over nations and continents was kindled in his heart. His own account of the event is as follows: "In the evening I went very unwillingly to a society in Aldersgate, where one was reading Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans. About a quarter before nine, while he was describing the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ, I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation; and an assurance was given me that he had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death." This was the experience which served as the foundation of his great work. To be sure, he was still troubled for an interval with doubts and perplexities, which probably were aggravated by the failure of the Moravian teachers to distinguish properly between assurance of justification and a state of full sanctification. But he had entered upon a lighted pathway in personal experience, — a pathway to be pursued with deepening confidence and satisfaction. Three days before his own emancipation his brother Charles had attained a like experience. As for Whitefield, he reached the stage of evangelical joy and freedom two or three years before either of the Wesleys.

To learn more perfectly concerning the way into which the good offices of the Moravians had introduced him, John Wesley determined to visit their headquar-

ters at Herrnhut. About three months were spent in this German tour. He gained an inside view of Moravian life and organization, communed with such leading spirits as Christian David, listened to the experiences of a number of the simple and earnest believers, and carried away some valuable suggestions.

In February, 1739, occurred the noted irregularity which opened a wide door to the revival. Here the agent was the warm-hearted and impulsive Whitefield, who naturally stood much less in awe of order and prescription than the Wesleys. Against him, as well as against them, notwithstanding the wonderful attraction of his eloquent preaching, church after church had been closed. At Bristol every door, even that of the prison, was shut against him. But the restless evangelist must speak. So he turned to the rude and benighted colliers of Kingswood, three or four miles from Bristol, and addressed them in the open air. Two hundred listened to the first message, two thousand to the second, and increasing thousands to those that followed. Gospel truth came to the poor people with all the force of a new revelation. As the preacher gazed into their awed faces, he was often able to discern the effect of his words by the white furrows which their tears made through the coal dust upon their cheeks.

With characteristic zest for rapid itinerating, Whitefield wished to start for other fields, and invited John Wesley to come and continue the work at Kingswood and Bristol. Wesley heeded the call, was introduced by Whitefield to his novel congregations, and fell in with the new style of evangelism, though not without a struggle against his prejudices. "I could," he writes,

"scarce reconcile myself at first to this strange way of preaching in the fields, having been all my life, till very lately, so tenacious of every point relating to decency and order that I should have thought the saving of souls almost a sin if it had not been done in a church." [1] For scholars and gentlemen to venture upon this kind of work, argues Isaac Taylor, "displayed a courage far surpassing that which carries the soldier through the hail-storm of the battle-field. Ten thousand might more easily be found who would confront a battery, than two who, with the sensitiveness of education about them, could mount a table by the roadside, give out a psalm, and gather a mob." But once initiated to the work, Wesley trampled his repugnance under foot, and settled into that conception of his mission in life which he expressed in the famous words, "I look upon all the world as my parish." [2] A church roofed by the sky, and covering the three kingdoms was henceforth his sanctuary. Of the five hundred or more sermons and expositions which he delivered in 1739, after receiving the summons of Whitefield, only eight were within the walls of churches.[3] Charles Wesley, in like manner, rose superior to the trammels of an impotent propriety, and entered heartily into the out-door evangelism.

In contrast with the moralizing commonly served from the pulpits of the day, Wesley and his co-laborers preached the supernatural religion of the New Testament, urging especially repentance, justification by faith, and the inward witness of the Spirit. They brought the terrors of the law to bear with full vigor

[1] Journal, March, 1739. [2] Journal, June, 1739.

[3] Tyerman, Life and Times of Wesley.

upon the torpid conscience, but magnified also the unstinted fulness of the grace which reaches after the chief of sinners. Preaching like this, born of deep conviction and emotion, produced deep conviction and emotion in many of the hearers. In numerous instances, especially in the early part of the revival, the unwonted struggle in the soul reacted with overwhelming effect upon the body. Men and women fell down in swoons or convulsive agitations. Some in the very midst of their protests against such unseemly and needless disorders, as they called them, were seized with the overmastering impulse, and fell down like the rest.

Respecting phenomena of this kind, it is to observed that they were not peculiar to the Methodist revival of the eighteenth century. Similar incidents have not unfrequently attended awakenings which have broken mightily through habitual torpor or ungodliness. For example, they appeared in New England in the time of Edwards, in the revival of 1800 in Kentucky, and among the Presbyterians of Ireland in 1859. The mainspring of such bodily exercises was doubtless, in these various instances, the profound and contagious excitement of the mind. It may indeed be objected that in the Methodist revival the physical phenomena were far more prominent under the preaching of John Wesley than under that of Charles Wesley or Whitefield, whereas the style of the first was less emotional and impassioned than was that of either of the other two. But it is possible that a quiet, deep-toned energy may produce as much effect as a more impassioned strain; and, moreover, it is not unlikely that John's

address was more productive of a searching introspection than was that of his brother evangelists. Charles had no charity for the extraordinary manifestations. John tolerated them on the ground that one must be careful not to oppose his personal fastidiousness to a method of working ordained or allowed by God. At the same time he regarded them as purely incidental, and indignantly denied the imputation that he ranked them among the marks of the new birth. As to the cause of the phenomena, his matured verdict inclined to the supposition of natural, supplemented by Satanic agency. Writing in 1744 of this class of events, he says that they may easily be accounted for, "either on principles of reason or Scripture. First, on principles of reason. For how easy is it to suppose that a strong, lively, and sudden apprehension of the heinousness of sin, the wrath of God, and the bitter pains of eternal death, should affect the body as well as the soul, during the present laws of vital union,—should interrupt or disturb the ordinary circulations, and put nature out of its course. Yea, we may question whether, while this union subsists, it be possible for the mind to be affected in so violent a degree, without some or other of those bodily symptoms following. It is likewise easy to account for these things on principles of Scripture. For when we take a view of them in this light, we are to add to the consideration of natural causes the agency of those spirits who excel in strength, and as far as they have leave of God, will not fail to torment whom they cannot destroy, to tear those that are coming to Christ."[1]

[1] Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion.

A movement such as the evangelists had inaugurated naturally did not proceed far, in an age really averse to earnest piety, and dreading enthusiasm more than the devil, without exciting violent opposition. Doubtless animosity, in some cases, was needlessly provoked by the less discreet of the laborers, who denounced the clergy, whom they deemed utterly negligent of their duties, in terms more unsparing than politic. Wesley himself expresses his regrets over an instance of this kind that was brought to his notice. But no amount of caution consistent with a vigorous prosecution of the work could have saved the movement from a venomous hatred and opposition. The hatred was in the spirit of the times, and it must needs vent itself; and it did vent itself right speedily and unmistakably. The mob, taking their inspiration from their superiors, were soon at work. Flying clods and stones became a frequent accompaniment of Methodist preaching. Raging crowds, abetted in some instances by clergymen and magistrates, maltreated the Methodist chiefs and their subordinates. In one case a whole community of Methodists (at Wednesbury and its neighborhood) were made the victims of a furious onset. Eighty houses had their windows smashed. Instances were not wanting in which outrage deepened into murderous violence. Some of the preachers were denounced as vagrants, and seized by the pressgang, and many of them were apparently more than once upon the verge of a sudden martyrdom. From the long catalogue of this class of incidents we give, as a specimen, the following item in the experience of Wesley, not because it is the most striking which he

has recorded, but as being of convenient brevity. Under date of Sept. 12, 1742, he writes: "Many of the beasts of the people labored much to disturb those who were of a better mind. They endeavored to drive a herd of cows among them; but the brutes were wiser than their masters. They then threw whole showers of stones, one of which struck me just between the eyes. But I felt no pain at all, and when I had wiped away the blood, went on testifying, with a loud voice, that God hath given to them that believe, not the spirit of fear, but of power and love, and of a sound mind." Wesley took events of this kind in a singularly complacent fashion, as though he regarded them a regular part of his ministerial pay. Among his rules for dealing with such scenes of turbulence was the maxim always to look a mob in the face.

But the violence of the mob was outdone by the violence of the pen. Methodism was pursued by a constant stream of invective and scurrility, in sermons, periodicals, and pamphlets. It was described as "a revival of the old fanaticism of the last century, when all manner of madness was practised, and all manner of villany committed in the name of Christ;" as an "enthusiasm made up of a thousand incoherencies and absurdities, picked and collected from the vilest errors and most pestilent follies of every heresy upon earth." Methodists were stigmatized as "restless deceivers," "insolent pretenders," "men of capricious humors, spiritual sleight, and canting craftiness," "profane hypocrites," "buffoons in religion and mountebanks in theology." It was hinted of Wesley that he was a Romish emissary, and that he was in the pay of the

Spanish government. One styled him "the first Protestant pope," and another, as if anxious to defy competition, declared that in him "the angel of darkness had made his incarnate appearance." Whitefield received, if possible, even a fuller measure of abuse than Wesley. Besides being assailed with all sorts of epithets, he was made to figure prominently in a comedy which was brought out to caricature Methodism. Most of the diatribes were allowed to pass unnoticed. An answer, however, was rendered to a few of the more important, such as Bishop Lavington's "Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists Compared." The bishop's performance neither honored himself nor the cause of religion in general. According to the severe comment of Julia Wedgwood, the facetious prelate "deserves to be coupled with the men who flung dead cats and rotten eggs at the Methodists, not with those who assailed their tenets with arguments, or even serious rebuke." [1]

2. Whitefield and Calvinistic Methodism.— George Whitefield was born in 1714. His father, who was an inn-keeper in Gloucester, died while George was in youth, and the care of his education devolved upon his mother. At the age of eighteen he entered Pembroke College, Oxford. His straitened circumstances had previously compelled him, at least for a time, to do menial duties at the inn, and at college he was obliged to work his way as a servitor. His early life had exhibited a mixture of religion and irreligion, but at college the religious impulses of his nature gained the

[1] John Wesley and the Evangelical Reaction of the Eighteenth Century. On the general subject of the paragraph see in particular Tyerman's Life and Times of John Wesley.

ascendency. After passing through a profound and painful struggle, he issued into a clear experience of divine grace. In 1736 he was admitted to orders, and began directly his remarkable preaching career. His very first efforts produced an extraordinary impression. In 1738 he visited America, and conceived the project of the orphan house in Georgia, an institution which continued to claim his affectionate interest till the end of his life. Early in 1739, as already stated, he led Methodism to the field of victory, by initiating outdoor preaching. In the same year he visited Wales, and started a second time for America. His first trip to Scotland occurred near the middle of 1741. But our space forbids us to particularize. Suffice it to say that, in his almost ubiquitous evangelism, he traversed England repeatedly, made numerous visits to Wales and Scotland, twice crossed into Ireland, made seven voyages to America, preached through the colonies on the Atlantic border, and died a few hours after delivering his last sermon, at Newburyport, Sept. 30, 1770.

Whitefield possessed but moderate learning and intellectual breadth. He was rather lacking in precision and poise. Cast out upon a conspicuous and tumultuous career as early as the age of twenty-three, he naturally exhibited some of the faults of immature thought and precipitate zeal. Of this he himself became conscious, and we find him writing, in 1748, as follows: "In how many things have I judged and acted wrong! I have been too rash and hasty in giving characters both of places and persons. Being fond of Scripture language, I have often used a style too apostolical; and at the same time I have been too bitter in my zeal.

Wild-fire has been mixed with it; and I frequently wrote and spoke in my own spirit, when I thought I was writing and speaking by the assistance of the Spirit of God. I have, likewise, too much made impressions my rule of acting; and have published, too soon and too explicitly, what had been better told after my death. By these things I have hurt the blessed cause I would defend, and have stirred up needless opposition." But for special errors of the head, and some lack of intellectual delicacy, there was a noble compensation in Whitefield. A more affectionate heart than his scarce ever beat in a human bosom. No one was ever more ready with a humble confession when once convinced of a fault.

Sacred oratory was the luminous centre in the genius of Whitefield. In natural gifts of thrilling and persuasive address he was one of the most remarkable men that ever lived. His power as an orator, however, was wrapped up with his personal presence, with his voice of wonderful compass and flexibility, with his action at once the height of grace and energy, with his manner shaped and informed by such intensity of conviction that he seemed to speak from the border of the spiritual world. His printed sermons fail almost utterly to reveal the orator; and indeed they are none too ample as specimens of his mere words and ideas. While he preached upwards of eighteen thousand times, only eighty-one sermons were committed to print, and of these, eighteen were issued without his revision or consent. Of the sixty-three authentic sermons remaining, at least forty-six were preached and printed before he was twenty-five years of age. The proof of his elo-

[1] Tyerman, Life of Whitefield.

quence lies not here, but in the effects of his preaching, and in the testimony of all classes of witnesses. While he melted the rude and the abandoned to repentance, he commanded the plaudits of the learned, the aristocratic, and the sceptical. Benjamin Franklin narrates how the orator got the best of him. He fully resolved to give nothing for the orphan house, because Whitefield insisted upon having it in Georgia, instead of accepting his advice to locate it in Philadelphia. "I happened," he says, "soon after, to attend one of his sermons, in the course of which I perceived that he intended to finish with a collection; and I silently resolved he should get nothing from me. I had in my pocket a handful of copper money, three or four silver dollars, and five pistoles in gold. As he proceeded, I began to soften, and concluded to give the copper. Another stroke of his oratory determined me to give the silver; and he finished so admirably that I emptied my pocket wholly into the collector's dish, gold and all." The same writer instances the fact that the utterance of Whitefield was most perfect and effective in sermons which he had many times repeated. Equally significant of the eloquence of the great preacher is the testimony of David Hume. He considered Whitefield the most ingenious preacher to whom he ever listened, and records this item from his recollections of his preaching: "Once Whitefield addressed his audience thus: 'The attendant angel is about to leave us and ascend to heaven. Shall he ascend and not bear with him the news of one sinner reclaimed from the error of his way?' And then, stamping with his foot, and lifting up his hand and eyes to heaven, he cried aloud,

'Stop, Gabriel, stop, ere you enter the sacred portal, and yet carry with you the tidings of one sinner being saved.' This address surpassed anything I ever saw or heard in any other preacher." The celebrated actor, David Garrick, is reported to have said, "I would give a hundred guineas if I could only say 'Oh!' like Mr. Whitefield." Lord Chesterfield also paid tribute to Whitefield's genius. "On one occasion when the great preacher was representing the sinner under the figure of a blind beggar, whose dog had broken from him, and who was groping on the brink of a precipice, over which he stepped and was lost, Chesterfield was so excited by the graphic description that he bounded from his seat and exclaimed, 'By heavens, the beggar is gone!'" The testimony of a prominent American ship-builder is worth adding. Having been persuaded to hear the noted evangelist, he was asked, "What do you think of Mr. Whitefield?" "Think?" said he, "I never heard such a man in my life. I tell you, sir, when I go to church I could build a ship from stem to stern under the sermon; but were it to save my soul, under Mr. Whitefield I could not lay a single plank."

Whitefield's earlier sermons show no trace of a specifically Calvinistic belief, and the causes of his preference for it are not very definitely given. Probably his reading and his intercourse with Congregationalists and Presbyterians in America were prominent factors in determining his bias. Passing hastily over the graver implications of the doctrine of unconditional election, he was attracted by its apparent exaltation of sovereign grace and its elimination of all contingency respecting the ultimate fortune of the converted person. In 1740

we find him unwaveringly intrenched in the Calvinistic tenet. About this time Wesley sent forth his most vigorous blast against the tenet, his sermon on Free Grace. The cause determining him to this step was by no means an ardent love of controversy. As he emphatically affirmed, he did not make the holding of the doctrine of election a bar to membership in the societies which he superintended. It was only the contentious advocacy of the same that he considered insufferable. On this principle he dealt with his lay helper at Kingswood, John Cennick, who, on the score of his Calvinistic belief, alienated the people from their leader, and wrote to Whitefield, then in America, to return and assist in opposing the Arminian errors. Wesley could not do otherwise than complain of such conduct. A rupture of the society at Kingswood ensued. The minds of not a few in the neighborhood were perplexed over the doctrinal question at issue. Under these circumstances, Wesley thought himself justified in publishing the sermon mentioned above. Whitefield was much offended by the sermon, and prepared an answer. Wesley was still ready for continued fellowship, and was far from the idea of opposing by name the advocates of predestination. But Whitefield, whether by his own choice or under the influence of more ardent partisans, decided that fellowship was out of the question. Referring to an interview held in March, 1741, Wesley says: "He told me he and I preached two different gospels; and therefore he not only would not join with me, or give me the right hand of fellowship, but was resolved publicly to preach against me and my brother, wherever he preached at

all." This estrangement, if ever it really sundered the bond of affection between the two men, was of short duration. Before the close of 1742 they seemed to have been united in heart, and addressed each other in friendly terms. Under date of November, 1755, Wesley wrote in his journal: "Mr. Whitefield called upon me. Disputings are now no more. We love one another, and join hand in hand to promote the cause of our common Master." Of Whitefield's regard for Wesley we have a striking index in the answer which he made to a censorious Calvinist who asked him whether they were likely to see John Wesley in heaven. "I fear not," was the reply; "he will be so near the throne, and we shall be at such a distance, that we shall hardly get a sight of him." This friendship remained unbroken, and after the death of Whitefield, which occurred before the outbreak of the more virulent Calvinistic controversy, both of the Wesleys lovingly commemorated the departed evangelist, the one in a funeral sermon, and the other in an elegiac poem.

But the heart union of the leaders was not destined to be represented by an organic union of Methodism. The Calvinistic and Arminian types made for themselves separate channels. As respects the organizing of the former, Whitefield took only a subordinate part. In the first stage of the history he exhibited a measure of activity in organizing societies; but as early as 1749 he had resolved to be simply an evangelist, to sow the seed in every open field, and leave others to do the harvesting. If in this way he failed to build up a compact organization wherewith to perpetuate his memory, he did not fail of permanent results. The

churches of England, Scotland, and America received from him a lasting impulse in vital religion. In the second stage the most prominent organizer of Calvinistic Methodism, at least on English soil, was Lady Huntingdon. After the death of her husband this remarkable woman devoted her heart and fortune to the interests of religion. Whitefield was constituted her chaplain, and preached in her mansion to the most aristocratic audiences assembled in England. The ample fortune of the countess was lavishly employed in building chapels, to which her influence secured the appointment of men of an earnest and devout spirit. A college for the training of ministers was endowed by her at Trevecca, in Wales. The idea was entertained, and in no small degree fulfilled, of leavening the Church of England with an evangelical ministry. "Like Wesley, Lady Huntingdon, with Whitefield, Howell Harris, and most of her preachers, was strongly attached to the Church of England. They wished not to be classed with Dissenters; but in order to protect her chapels from suppression, or appropriation by the Established Church, she had to avail herself, in 1779, of the 'Toleration Act,' a law by which all religious societies that would not be subject to the established ecclesiastical power, could control their own chapels by an avowal direct or virtual, of dissent. Her 'Connection' thus took its place among the Dissenting churches, and Romaine, Townsend, Venn, and many others of her most influential co-laborers belonging to the establishment, ceased to preach in her chapels." [1]

In England, Calvinistic Methodism, as a distinct

[1] Stevens, History of Methodism, i. 170, 171.

organization, made but moderate progress after the death of Whitefield. One wing, the so-called Tabernacle Connection, or Whitefield Methodists, inclined toward the forms of the Congregationalists, and a large proportion of their societies were absorbed by that denomination. Lady Huntingdon's Connection, on the other hand, adhered to the liturgical forms of the Anglican Church. Trevecca, and later Cheshunt College, served as its educational centre. The Connection continued to hold its ground, but was not favored with any marked advancement.

Wales was the preferred ground of Calvinistic Methodism in its organized form. Among those who figured in the heroic age of Welsh Methodism a foremost place belongs to Howell Harris and Daniel Rowlands. The former was a veritable Boanerges, whose impromptu speech rose above the din of mobs, and whose courage was ready for a new trial before yet he had been healed of the bruises received in a preceding encounter. Rowlands was a pulpit orator, who carefully prepared his sermons, but put into them the living energy of intense conviction. Multitudes came from far and near to hear his quickening message while he served as rector of Llangeitho. At length, in 1763, the hostility of his clerical brethren drove him out of the Established Church. A quieter, but no less enduring service than that of these hardy evangelists was rendered by a convert of Howell Harris, William Williams of Pantycelyn, the sacred poet of his country, whose hymns still claim pre-eminence in the Welsh collection, and whose talent has also very beautiful memorials in English hymnbooks. Thomas Charles, of Bala, who cast in his lot

with the Methodists in 1785, wrought efficiently in the promotion of education among the common people, and in the organization of the societies. It was first in 1811 that the Welsh societies entered upon the status of an independent communion. Before the year 1880 the number of members had exceeded a hundred thousand.[1]

3. CHARLES WESLEY AND METHODIST HYMNOLOGY. — Charles Wesley, if less adapted for practical achievements among men than his brother John, was, on the whole his efficient coadjutor. For a series of years he was his associate in the perils and toils of the itinerancy, and though he ceased after 1756 from extensive journeyings, he remained still attached to Methodism, and devoted his ministry to its societies in London and Bristol. In his later years he was troubled with apprehensions that a separation from the Established Church might occur, and was afflicted by some points in his brother's policy, especially his ordinations. But these differences were not allowed to sever the bond of affection between the two brothers.

Charles in temperament was much less even and settled than his brother. "Few ministers," says Jackson, "it is presumed, have been subject to greater variation of feeling than Charles Wesley. When travelling from place to place, preaching the word of life, and witnessing the power of divine grace in the conversion of ungodly men, his joy sometimes rose to rapture, and at other times his energies were paralyzed by despondency, and he earnestly desired to descend into the grave." In domestic life, whether by reason of greater aptitude for the married state or not, he was infinitely more happy than his brother.

[1] See W. Williams Welsh Calvinistic Methodism.

Though a preacher of no mean ability, Charles Wesley is known almost wholly for his unique gifts in sacred poetry. More than any other whose poetic talent was enkindled by the revival, he lived and moved and had his being in sacred song. Fitted by his classical training to understand the niceties of verse, holding theological views in full sympathy with the most august, tender, and fruitful themes of the gospel, possessing religious sensibilities that were easily kindled to a flame, and having a command over language which made it the facile instrument of his thought and feeling, he was every way qualified to be a master hymnist. The distinct products of his poetical genius were in the neighborhood of seven thousand. As the hymns of the Jewish Psalter were the adequate vehicle for almost every phase of Hebrew piety, so the hymns of Charles Wesley give apt expression to nearly every characteristic thought and feeling of Protestant Christianity. "It may be affirmed," says Isaac Taylor, "that there is no principal element of Christianity, no main article of belief as professed by Protestant churches; that there is no moral or ethical sentiment peculiarly characteristic of the gospel; no height or depth of feeling, proper to the spiritual life, that does not find itself emphatically and pointedly and clearly conveyed in some stanza of Charles Wesley's hymns." Stoughton aptly remarks: "There are hymns of smoother versification and pervaded by a serener spirit, — more suited to Anglo-Catholics, and perhaps to sedate Nonconformists; but for light and life, force and fire, no compositions can compare with those of the Methodist poets. They bear distinctly a character of their own, and reflect the ex-

citement out of which they rose. Perhaps at times Isaac Watts may have surpassed them in calm grandeur of conception, and Philip Doddridge in tenderness of sentiment; but beyond anything in either, there are in Charles Wesley's hymns tones of conflict and victory which resemble the voice of a trumpet, and strains of praise like the sound of many waters."

It was the fortune of Charles Wesley to reach the goal before his brother. He died March 29, 1788. A fortnight later the surviving brother, then in his eighty-fifth year, while conducting service at Bolton, gave out the hymn of the deceased poet beginning with the words, "Come, O Thou Traveller unknown." As he reached the lines —

> "My company before is gone,
> And I am left alone with Thee,"

the bereaved old man was overpowered by his emotions, burst into a flood of tears, and was unable for a few moments to proceed with the service. A companionship extending over three quarters of a century, notwithstanding some differences on points of expediency, had nurtured a rare affection between the organizer and the poet of Methodism.

4. John Wesley and Organized Methodism. — John Wesley started out with no elaborate system of religious organization in his mind. The Moravians, with whom he was at first associated, illustrated (at this time in England) the general idea at the basis of his scheme, namely, that of societies within a church; but the more specific features of Methodist economy were provided one after another in answer to some special exigency. The first societies of which Wesley may be

regarded as the founder were instituted in 1739, at Bristol and London. The former city witnessed the first project for the *building* of a Methodist chapel, but the latter had the preaching house that was first *opened* for use. This was the Foundry, a deserted building, which was appropriated by Wesley in November, 1739. "This date has been considered the epoch of Methodism, for thenceforward the Foundry was its headquarters in London."[1] It is to be noticed, however, that the societies instituted in 1739 had a Moravian or semi-Moravian status, Wesley being at that time a member of a Moravian society, and acting in conjunction with the fraternity. But the next year marked a rupture with the Moravians, and Wesley's societies stood then upon an independent basis. The cause of the rupture was certain strange notions which had invaded the Moravian societies in London, and which gained in them for a season the ascendency. These notions were nothing less than a pronounced quietism. The leaders in the aberration, among whom Philip Molther was conspicuous, taught that any degree of doubt is inconsistent with justifying faith, and that until this faith is bestowed one must abstain from outward means of grace, lest he be led to trust in them instead of trusting in Christ alone. These mischievous tenets infected the society in Fetter-lane, which had received its constitution from Peter Boehler, but had been largely under the supervision of Wesley. Finding himself unable to make headway against the erroneous teachings, Wesley took his leave of the society in July, 1740, having previously requested those of like mind to accompany him.

[1] Stevens, History of Methodism, i. 131.

The first chapels that were built for Wesley's societies were vested in himself; but after a few years property of this kind was devolved upon trustees. The expense incurred in chapel-building gave rise in 1742 to an important feature in Methodist economy. For the more effective collection of funds, the societies were divided into classes of twelve, one of the twelve serving as collector, and being responsible for a penny a week for each member. Forthwith it was discerned that this class system could be made useful for other than financial ends, that, indeed, it could be made to serve as a beneficent means of discipline and religious edification. So the financial became an eminently religious institution, and the collector, or class leader, a kind of sub-pastor.

Among Wesley's auxiliaries, the lay preachers were perhaps the most important. So long as he maintained his position as a member of the Established Church, and refrained from founding a separate sect, they were simply indispensable in a work of rapid and extensive evangelism. The requisite laborers could not be found among those who were in orders. The only feasible method was to accept the services of laymen, who, if not highly cultured in many instances, were nevertheless far more competent to enlighten and elevate the degraded masses than any agency besides that was available. As early as 1739 Wesley employed John Cennick as a lay helper, if not strictly as a lay preacher. Tyerman maintains that Cennick labored at Kingswood in the latter capacity. If this conclusion be accepted, it is necessary to explain why Wesley was so much exercised, in 1740 or 1741, by the

news that Thomas Maxfield was preaching to the society in London. The explanation is not clear, unless it be assumed that Wesley had regard to difference of men and places, and thought that the recently converted layman was venturing upon too high a responsibility in undertaking to preach to the London congregation. Whatever the previous facts in the case, Wesley was convinced by the advice of his mother and by his own observation of Maxfield's gifts that he ought not to be restrained from preaching, and from that time the talents of laymen in expounding the Word were freely called into requisition. By the year 1744 about two score of these lay preachers were in Wesley's employ. These men generally were fitted for their work by a genuine experience of the saving power of the gospel, by a living sympathy with the poor people, and by a hardihood and courage which prepared them to endure privation, and to face the violence of the mob. Some of them had a rare knowledge of men, and great skill in the arts of address. Some of them, too, came to possess no mean acquaintance with books, at least with those more directly connected with their vocation; for upon nothing did Wesley insist with greater vigor than upon diligence in his preachers to improve their opportunities for study. The names of some of these men impartial history will ever treasure with veneration and affection. John Nelson, the converted mason, for example, will be known as long as Methodism claims a place in the world. A more engaging specimen of sturdy and consecrated manhood, of invincible patience and courage, of zeal ballasted by strong common-sense, has scarce ever emerged from the ranks of the common people in England.

Wesley's position in relation to his preachers and the members of his societies was that of a head of a voluntary association. He consulted with them freely; he met the preachers annually in conference, the first gathering of this kind being in 1744; but the real authority remained nevertheless in his own hands. To enter his Connection was equivalent to entering into a personal engagement with him to be subject to his scheme. Every one was free to come or go, and very little ceremony was requisite in either case, but the fact of membership, so long as it existed, was an acknowledgment of Wesley's leadership. We find him, accordingly, defining his own power as follows: "It is a power of admitting into and excluding from the societies under my care; of choosing and removing stewards; of receiving or not receiving helpers; of appointing them where, when, and how to help me; and of desiring any of them to meet me when I see good." No doubt Wesley had inherent qualities naturally impelling to leadership; but that love of authority was allowed to interfere with conviction of duty, there is no adequate evidence. He took the lead no less in labor and hardship than in governing. His work had far advanced before any one appeared either fitted or willing to share his responsibility. The engagements of his preachers were then with him, and whether they would be bound to others depended upon their choice. Some will think that in his later years he ought to have shared his power with the Conference. Possibly this might have been done with good effect. Still there was some ground for fearing that a change of this kind would interfere with the efficient prosecution of the work in hand.

We may conclude that Wesley spoke with entire sincerity, if not with entire understanding of himself, when he said to the Conference of 1766: "I did not seek any part of this power; it came upon me unawares; but when it was come, not daring to bury that talent, I used it to the best of my judgment. Yet I never was fond of it; I always did, and do now, bear it as my burden,—the burden which God lays upon me, and therefore I dare not yet lay it down. But if you can tell me any one, or any five men, to whom I may transfer this burden, who *can* and *will* do just what I do now, I will heartily thank both them and you."

Up to his death Wesley both wrote and spoke against separation from the Established Church. At the same time, however, he looked upon separation as something very likely to occur in the near future, and it cannot be denied that he took steps in its direction,—steps which may be regarded as virtually leading on to the territory of dissent. In other words, he was an inconsistent Churchman, attached to the Church of England, but more attached to the kingdom of Christ, and constrained to do violence to his relation to the one that he might serve what he considered to be the interests of the other. This appears especially in his ordinations. Many in his societies were inconvenienced as respects the sacraments, not being able to obtain them at all, or only from clergymen whose manifest lack of vital piety so offended their religious instincts that their hearts revolted against their ministrations. Being denied the aid of the bishops in meeting this need, Wesley, at length, after years of delay, proceeded himself to the work of ordination.

First, in 1784, he ordained Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vasey presbyters, and Thomas Coke superintendent, at the same time commissioning the last to ordain Francis Asbury to the office of superintendent.

These ordinations all had reference to the United States, the independence of which, recently achieved, had placed them outside of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of England. Under these conditions, Wesley naturally concluded that his American societies ought to be erected into an independent church. In 1785 he ordained John Pawson, Thomas Hanby, and Joseph Taylor to administer the sacraments in Scotland. In the succeeding two or three years several more were ordained for the same field. Finally (1788–89), he ordained Alexander Mather, Thomas Rankin, and Henry Moore, to minister in England. The first of these three was still farther ordained to the rank of superintendent; but no special use was made of the dignity.

In ordaining to the rank of presbyters, Wesley certainly kept within prerogatives allowed by the theory of church government, which he had entertained for years. As early as 1746 his reading of Lord King's account of the primitive Church had shaken his notions about the necessity of bishops and their original distinction from presbyters. Ten years later we find him penning this decisive statement: "I still believe the episcopal form of church government to be Scriptural and apostolical; I mean well agreeing with the practice and writings of the apostles. But that it is *prescribed* in Scripture, I do not believe. This opinion, which I once zealously espoused, I have been heartily ashamed of

ever since I read Bishop Stillingfleet's 'Irenicon.' I think he has unanswerably proved that neither Christ nor His apostles *prescribe* any particular form of church government; and that the plea of *divine right* for diocesan episcopacy was never heard of in the primitive Church." Believing thus in the original identity of presbyters and bishops and the optional character of episcopacy, he did not at all transcend his ecclesiastical theory when, as a presbyter, he proceeded to ordain to the like office. But was his act in ordaining accordant with the polity and practice of the Established Church of England as understood on all sides in his day? Certainly not. It was an irregularity, a cutting loose from constituted authority, of so grave a character as to be virtually the initiation of ecclesiastical independence.

As respects also Wesley's ordinations to the rank of superintendent, it cannot be definitely charged that Wesley transcended his theory of church constitution, while at the same time it must of course be allowed that he acted counter to the established polity of the church of which he was a member. It has been urged that Coke, being a presbyter, had as good a right to ordain Wesley superintendent as Wesley to ordain him. Undoubtedly, so far as the mere fact of ecclesiastical rank was concerned. But there were other facts of determining force in the case. Wesley was looked upon as the father of the American societies. He had a *de facto* authority over them. They were at liberty to repudiate this authority if they pleased. But they were not pleased to do so. They greatly preferred that his authority should be used in assisting them to pro-

vide satisfactorily for their ecclesiastical needs. In sending Coke as superintendent, Wesley simply made the satisfactory provision, and made it too, though in a somewhat extraordinary way, yet not by the usurpation of any unprecedented prerogatives. Supposing superintendent to be equivalent to bishop, instances could be cited both from the primitive Church, and from the Church of the Reformation, showing that it was no unheard of thing that bishops should be ordained by presbyters.[1] But what did Wesley mean by the term "superintendent"? Did he use it merely as a modest equivalent of "bishop"? Some have answered in the negative, and have blamed those who substituted the latter for the former term. No doubt the substitution was not agreeable to Wesley, but at the same time, no serious misnomer, no real contradiction of the newly

[1] "The appointment of a bishop by presbyters," says Jackson, "is no novelty, as the early history of the Church of Alexandria demonstrates, as well as that of the Lutheran Church in Germany. In the appointment of Dr. Coke Mr. Wesley did no more than the great German reformer had done to meet the wants of the people whom God had given him. Every reader of ecclesiastical history knows that Martin Luther, again and again, with the aid and concurrence of his fellow-presbyters, ordained bishops for the Protestant Church of Germany." (Life of Charles Wesley, p. 751.)

Stanley, referring to the induction of Athanasius into the episcopal office, says: "Down to this time (according to the tradition of the Alexandrian Church itself) the election to this great post had been conducted in a manner unlike that of the other sees of Christendom. Not the bishop, but twelve presbyters, were the electors and nominators, and, according to Eutychius, consecrators. It was on the death of Alexander that this ancient custom was exchanged for one more nearly resembling that which prevailed elsewhere." (Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church, pp. 325, 326.) Compare Bishop Lightfoot, Christian Ministry, in Commentary on Philip., pp. 228–236.

constituted office, was involved in the use of the title "bishop." A superintendent, solemnly inducted into office by an extra laying-on of hands, and accredited with supervisory power over a body of presbyters, is not a simple presbyter. He exercises functions generally associated with the episcopal office, and to all practical intents is a bishop. A superintendent of this kind Wesley plainly meant to provide.

The same year that Wesley consummated his American ordinations, he provided for the permanent and legal standing of his Connection on British soil. His Deed of Declaration (1784) constituted one hundred of his preachers to be the legal Conference after his death, this conference being empowered to fill its own vacancies, to receive and to expel preachers, and to appoint them, under certain restrictions, to their fields of labor. "Subsequently, by a wise accommodation, all the preachers who were in connection with the Conference were permitted to vote, and such as had been members a given number of years were allowed to put the President in nomination, by their votes for the confirmation of the Legal Hundred."[1]

Wesley was far from being indifferent to dogma. No important work like his was ever built upon moonshine. Great evangelical truths, decisively grasped, and vitalized by intense conviction, lay at the foundation of the Methodist revival. Nevertheless, Wesley regarded beliefs entirely subordinate to purity of heart and life, and valued the former only as a means of inspiring and sustaining the latter. He required no

[1] Stevens, History of Methodism, ii. 207.

lengthy confession of faith as a condition of admission into his societies. "Is a man a believer in Jesus Christ?" he wrote, in 1765, "and is his life suitable to his profession?" are not only the main, but the sole inquiries I make in order to his admission into our society. The essence of religion he defined as nothing else than "humble, gentle, patient love." He commended the saying that "God made practical divinity necessary, the devil, controversial," and lamented on one occasion that the circumstances required him to spend ten minutes of his sermon in controversy, a larger amount of time than he had publicly given to this kind of work for many months before.[1] Across all lines of sect he was able to discern spiritual kindred. Concerning Marcus Aurelius he said: "I make no doubt but this is one of those many who shall come from the east and the west, and sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, while the children of the kingdom, nominal Christians, are shut out." However much he reprobated the opinions of the Quakers, he found his heart captivated by the piety of William Edmundson, and exclaimed, "Could mistakes send such a man as this to hell? Not so. I am so far from believing this that I scruple not to say, Let my soul be with the soul of William Edmundson!" Some of the examples of religious consecration most admired by him were found within the borders of Roman Catholicism. Of Thomas à Kempis and Francis de Sales he wrote, "I doubt not they are now in Abraham's bosom."

Very soon after his conversion Wesley gave decided expression to the main points of his theological scheme.

[1] Journal, 1751.

Indeed his earlier exposition of some of these points was more radical than his later.

Like all who took a prominent part in the great revival, Wesley emphasized the doctrine of justification by faith. At the same time, however, he laid great stress upon good works, — not indeed, as a primary condition of justification, but as binding upon the conscience, as the necessary fruits of faith, as indispensable to the retention of the divine favor, and to progress in the divine life. Accordingly, we find him dissatisfied with Luther's commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, and charging him with a too lax and disparaging tone in his references to the law.[1] The same order of thought is conspicuous in the General Rules which he prepared for his societies. The idea of neglecting the common Christian duties on the score of any subjective caprice stirs a righteous indignation in him, and he speaks of "trampling under foot that enthusiastic doctrine of devils, that we are not to do good unless our hearts are free to it." He constantly gives a prominent place to the ethical element in religion. In this he undoubtedly rendered a most needful and important service to Methodism. Inculcating, as it does, a strongly subjective type of piety, magnifying the believer's privilege in respect to inward experiences, it needs just such a safeguard against fanatical superiority to externals as the phase of teaching in question.

At first Wesley was disposed to insist upon assurance as invariably an accompaniment of justification, so that its absence would be proof of the lack of justifying

[1] Journal, June, 1741.

grace. But he afterwards retreated from this radical position, and while he emphasized the common privilege of believers to walk in the light of assurance, he allowed that one might be in a justified state who was not clearly assured of the fact.

On the subject also of Christian perfection, or entire sanctification, Wesley made at an early date his strongest statement. Some points on the subject expressed in the preface to a hymn-book, published not later than the spring of 1741 (Tyerman says in 1740), were afterwards modified as being by far too radical. According to his matured theory, Christian perfection was understood to imply exemption from sin, from everything contrary to love, but not from mistakes in judgment and corresponding mistakes in action, not from wandering thoughts and other species of temptation which invade the mind without being consented to or cherished. It was farther described as a perfection accommodated to man's actual powers, involving, therefore, not such a service as angels or the unfallen Adam were able to render, but only the best service which a nature wounded by the fall, and retaining ever in this world certain infirmities despite the healing work of divine grace, is competent to render. It does not appear that Wesley at first distinctly inculcated the idea that this crowning grace is to be suddenly grasped by a simple act of faith. But as one witness after another appeared who testified that they had in this manner obtained it, he came to the conclusion that, though there is likely to be more or less of an interval between justification and entire sanctification, believers ought to be encouraged to seek for the higher state by a distinct

act of faith, and not by a prolonged discipline. According to Wesley, an adequate assurance of having attained this state requires, among other evidences, the positive witness of the Holy Spirit. He also, at least on certain occasions, advised caution in preaching or testifying upon the subject before promiscuous assemblies.

There is no distinct proof on record that Wesley himself ever claimed to have experienced the grace of entire sanctification. On the contrary, there is evidence that when far on in life he disclaimed its possession;[1] and to the end he practised a reserve in the matter of personal testimony that might profitably have been imitated by more than one of his followers. Nevertheless, he affirmed with great constancy the doctrine of the attainability of the supreme grace. Very serious discouragements to its advocacy arose. In 1762 some of those in London, professing to have been entirely sanctified, ran into open fanaticism, contemning their more sober teachers, and boasting with intemperate zest of visions and prophesyings. An unbalanced man, by the name of George Bell, was the ringleader in the folly, but more or less of countenance was given to it by a man of so good repute as Thomas Maxfield. Bell finally spoiled his reputation as a prophet by fixing a date for the end of the world, and Maxfield, disowning Wesley's leadership, became the head of an independent society. These events produced a reaction in the mind of Charles Wesley, so that he began to teach, not, indeed, that entire sanctification is unattainable in this life, but that it is to be expected only in those

[1] Tyerman, ii. 598.

ripened by long discipline, and is not to be made prominent as a matter of personal testimony. John, on the other hand, while he insisted upon searching tests, held to his former views with full conviction, and that, too, in the face of an extensive reaction. In 1766 we find him declaring that a general faintness had fallen upon the whole kingdom as respects the subject of Christian perfection, and that he was almost weary of striving against the stream both of preachers and people. A few years later he affirmed that only a very small proportion of those once professing the grace had retained it. In 1772 he complained that almost all his preachers, while they believed in perfection, failed to make it a living issue, preaching upon it not at all, or only at long intervals. A sufficient list of discouragements, surely! That Wesley continued to press the doctrine shows the importance that it claimed in his estimate.

In proportion as Wesley emphasized the ethical side of Christianity, and insisted upon good works, he was jealous of the tenets of high Calvinism. While, no doubt, he abhorred them from a theoretical point of view, he honestly feared their practical influence. He regarded them as naturally affording shelter to the Antinomianism which he detested above all things. Occasionally he found those who had become infected with the Antinomian virus. Accordingly, at the Conference of 1770 he believed it opportune to warn his preachers against leaning too much to Calvinism, against lowering the claims of the law, and disparaging the worth of good works. Addressing those who were understood to make no question about the Protestant

doctrine of justification by faith, Wesley was not careful to guard his statements in the interests of that doctrine; in fact, he made use of expressions that might be regarded as qualifying the doctrine somewhat seriously. This was unfortunate. The minutes of 1770 passed under the notice of those for whom they were not primarily designed. The needed explanations which a friendly Arminian could supply, the Calvinist was slow to devise. A cry of disapprobation arose from the Calvinistic Methodists and their sympathizers. The minutes were stigmatized as Pelagian and papistical. At the ensuing Conference explanations were offered which were deemed satisfactory by representatives of the offended party. But controversial animosity having once been excited easily found occasion to burn with increasing ardor. On the Calvinistic side the principal champions were Richard Hill, Rowland Hill, and Augustus Toplady. These men, on the whole, were eminently distinguished by earnest and self-denying piety; but in this controversy they appear distinguished for nothing so much as for polemic bitterness and virulence. They seem to have acted upon the principle that it was necessary to crush John Wesley, that they were the men to do it, and that in doing it they were justified in going outside of the matter in dispute, and raking together everything that could serve as material of personal opprobrium. Toplady avowedly proceeded on this principle. He was convinced that Wesley was "the most rancorous hater of the gospel system" that ever had appeared in England, and that he deserved the utmost severity of treatment that could be visited upon him. "Mr. John Wesley,"

he says, "is the only opponent I ever had whom I chastised with a studious disregard to ceremony. Nor do I in the least repent of the manner in which I treated him. . . . I only gave him the whip when he deserved a scorpion." Toplady looked through the distorting medium of a perfect horror of Arminianism. He viewed it as a profane assault upon the divine sovereignty, a system in which the Creator is brought down into pitiful subjection to the creature, a system closely allied to the Epicurean doctrine of chance, and justly exposed to the charge of atheism. Indeed, he went so far in his detestation of Arminianism as to question the salvability of its persistent upholders. "I much question," he says, "whether the man that dies an Arminian can go to heaven. But certainly he will not be an Arminian when he is in heaven." According to his own system, the creature is under the dominion of an absolute causation, which is distinguished from a universal and inexorable fatalism only by having its seat in a personal intelligence and will. In other words, God determines beyond all contingency every item in the creature's fortunes. Speaking of fate, he says: "If you mean a regular succession of determined events, from the beginning to the end of time, an uninterrupted chain without a single chasm, all depending on the eternal will and continued influence of the great First Cause,— if this is fate, it must be owned that it and the Scripture predestination are at most very thinly divided, or rather, entirely coalesce."

Wesley himself took little part in the controversy, and the task of answering assailants devolved mainly

upon Walter Sellon, Thomas Olivers, and John William Fletcher. The first two were spirited disputants, and repaid their opponents with something of their own coin. Fletcher, on the other hand, was too much of a saint not to sanctify controversy itself with the leaven of Christian love. He was a man in whom ardent devotion and tender charity were blended into a charming unity. The testimonies which have been pronounced in his favor make as complete a canonizing sentence as was ever issued. Wesley declared him the most unblamable man that he had met in the course of his four-score years. Robert Hall said: "Fletcher is a seraph who burns with the ardor of divine love. Spurning the fetters of mortality, he almost habitually seems to have anticipated the rapture of the beatific vision." Henry Venn wrote of him: "I have known all the great men for these fifty years; but I have known none like him. I was intimately acquainted with him, and was under the same roof with him once for six weeks, during which time I never heard him say a single word which was not proper to be spoken, and which had not a tendency to minister grace to the hearers."

The way in which Fletcher's enthusiastic piety manifested itself would be almost certain to appear obtrusive in another. But in him freedom of expression was joined with a grace and gentility which overcame the impression of forwardness or intemperateness. His *courtesy* was no small element in his influence. "It was pure and genuine," says Wesley, "and sweetly constrained him to behave to every one (although particularly to inferiors), in a manner not to be described,

6

with so inexpressible a mixture of humility, love, and respect. This directed his words, the tone of his voice, his looks, his whole attitude, his every motion." To similar effect is the remark of Benson: "His manner was so solemn, and at the same time so mild and insinuating, that it was hardly possible for any one to be in his company without being struck with awe and charmed with love." The subduing effect of this amiable bearing was well illustrated in the case of a prominent Dissenting minister, Thomas Reader, who called upon Fletcher in order to take him to task for what he regarded as erroneous teaching in a recent publication. "Fletcher, knowing him by name, ran from his study to receive his visitor, and spreading out his hands, exclaimed, 'Come in, come in, thou blessed of the Lord! Am I so honored as to receive a visit from so esteemed a servant of my Master? Let us have a little prayer, while refreshments are getting ready.' Mr. Reader was puzzled. He remained three days, but was utterly unable to muster sufficient courage to even intimate the object of his visit. Afterwards he stated that he never enjoyed three days of such spiritual and profitable intercourse in all his life."[1]

Switzerland was the native land of Fletcher, where he was born in 1729. After finding his way to England (1752), and spending an interval in perfecting his acquaintance with the English language, he served as tutor in the family of Thomas Hill, of Tern Hall. In 1757, he entered into holy orders, and three years later began work in the parish to which he was attached for

[1] For this and other facts, see Tyerman, Life, Letters, and Literary Labors of John William Fletcher.

the remainder of his life. His choice of this parish was an eccentricity of piety very rarely witnessed in those times. While he was offered Dunham, he took Madeley, as providing more work and less salary. The difficulties of the field, as also the spirit in which he entered upon it, are indicated by these words written soon after his installation: "The bulk of the inhabitants are stupid heathens, who seem past all curiosity, as well as all sense of godliness. I am ready to run after them into their pits and forges, and I only wait for Providence to show me the way. I am often reduced to great perplexity, but the end of it is sweet. I am driven to the Lord, and He comforts, encourages, and teaches me." The generous manner in which he cared for his parishioners is thus described by Benson: "The profusion of his charity toward the poor and needy is scarcely credible. It constantly exhausted his purse; it frequently unfurnished his home; and sometimes left him destitute of the common necessaries of life. That he might feed the hungry, he led a life of abstinence and self-denial; and that he might cover the naked, he clothed himself in the most homely attire."

Before he had taken orders, Fletcher had made acquaintance with the Methodists, and conceived for them a cordial friendship. He entertained in particular a profound regard for Wesley. Accordingly, when the controversy began to rage over the obnoxious minutes, he stepped out of his place as president of Lady Huntingdon's college at Trevecca, freely gave his friend the benefit of his industry and talent, and published his "Checks to Antinomianism." As an offset to the arguments of opponents, and also, for the most part, as a

presentation of Biblical and practical points of view, these controversial writings of Fletcher were an eminent success. While he deals in a brotherly way with the persons of his antagonists, he indulges in many sharp thrusts at their opinions. A passage or two will illustrate. "Nothing can be more absurd," he says, "than to affirm that when 'something is required to be done in order to receive a favor, the favor loses the name of a free gift, and directly becomes a debt.' I say to two beggars, Hold out your hand, here is an alms for you. The one complies, and the other refuses. Who in the world will dare to say that my charity is no more a *free gift*, because I bestow it only upon the man that held out his hand? Will nothing make it *free* but my wrenching his hand open, or forcing my bounty down his throat?" "Suppose a schoolmaster said to his English scholars, 'Except you instantly speak Greek, you shall all be severely whipped,' you would wonder at the injustice of the school tyrant. But would not the wretch be merciful in comparison with a Saviour (so-called), who is supposed to say to myriads of men who can no more repent than ice can burn, 'Except ye repent ye shall all perish'? I confess, then, when I see real Protestants calling this doctrine 'the pure gospel,' I no more wonder that real Papists should call their bloody inquisition the house of mercy, and their burning of those whom they call heretics an *auto de fé*, or act of faith." "Let no one say that we wrong the Calvinian decree of reprobation when we call it a horrible decree, for Calvin himself is honest enough to call it so."

Some of Fletcher's representations may be open to

correction. In particular, the propriety of the terms which he employs in distinguishing between a first and a second justification may be questioned. But the general vivacity of style and energy of thought in the "Checks to Antinomianism" must be recognized by any candid reader, and their relative superiority in the controversy which occasioned them is unmistakable. Says one, whose denominational connections might have begotten sympathy with the opposing party: "Whatever may be the theological opinions of any one who has studied the controversy, he must needs admit that Fletcher had the advantage in precision of thought, in skilful reasoning, and in eloquence of expression. Without justifying all his conclusions, whilst demurring to several of his arguments, I must bear witness to the high moral tone and sweet Christian temper of these productions, and not forget to remark that he could and did rise to an elevation above one-sided views, and brought together what in other parts of the discussion were too often torn asunder." [1]

Fletcher's labors were ended in 1785. His death was a special grief to Wesley. One of his cherished hopes had been that the vicar of Madeley might become his successor in the leadership of the societies.

The preceding pages have so largely revealed the character of Wesley that little needs to be added specifically upon this subject. Criticism, no doubt, has its opportunity here as well as elsewhere. It has pointed, for example, to a species of credulity, a too ready assent to the supposition of supernatural agency in connection with unusual or surprising events. And, in

[1] John Stoughton, History of Religion in England, vi. 268.

truth, it cannot be denied that Wesley's journal betrays a certain zest for the marvellous. This is evinced, if by nothing else, by the *amount of space* which he gives to narratives of experiences of a fanciful or extraordinary cast. At the same time, it must be allowed in justice to Wesley, that all such experiences went for nothing with him as opposed to the grand spiritual and ethical tests of character which are laid down in the New Testament. Again, it may be charged against him that in one and another instance he showed a certain precipitancy in judging opinions, and a needless severity in strictures upon persons. This must be allowed, but the statement should go with the second of these specifications, that Wesley was exceedingly fond of open dealing, and if he gave plain talk to others, he was able betimes to receive it himself with good grace, and, moreover, was never disposed to ask an opponent to come more than half way before welcoming him in the spirit of genuine reconciliation. Again, it may be alleged that the rigid scheme which he imposed upon his school at Kingswood bespeaks a heart out of sympathy with the impulses and needs of childhood. No doubt, the Kingswood régime was quite remote from modern notions of youthful discipline; but to some extent it is to be charged against the times, and at most was an index of Wesley's head rather than of his heart. He lavished a generous love upon children, and some of the scenes which shed most of a mellow radiance upon the closing years of his pilgrimage are those which reveal his tenderness for the young or their responsive affection for him. The charge of ambition, which some of the earlier critics were disposed to

urge, requires but a brief answer. That Wesley was not wholly beyond the infirmity which disposes most men to relinquish with a degree of reluctance power which has long been exercised, is to be granted. He was loath to withhold his hand from Methodist affairs in America after the societies had been constituted a distinct church. He imposed his own thinking upon his English preachers in a somewhat remarkable manner. The selection of his "Notes on the New Testament" and four volumes of his sermons to be a doctrinal standard was a piece of paternalism which may be explained, in large part, by Wesley's peculiar relations to his workmen, but is not easily justified. These facts, we conceive, indicate some share in the very natural inclination to hold on to power once acquired. But this is far from being identical with conscious self-seeking. Wesley did not live in the same zone with a shallow, earthy ambition. The accusation of plagiarism, out of which Toplady made so much capital, demands still less notice. No doubt Wesley's "Address to the Colonies" was little else than an abridgment of Johnson's pamphlet on the subject, and it would have been wise to have mentioned this fact. But Wesley probably judged that the fact of abridgment would be understood, the treatise of Johnson being so prominently before the public. In any case, Johnson himself, so far as is known, was not disposed to complain. On the contrary, he was much pleased to have the aid of Wesley in circulating his arguments. According to Isaac Taylor, another must be added to the list of defects, or alleged imperfections, in the great evangelist, namely, his lack of domestic instincts. "Wesley,"

he says, "apostolic man as he was, and having a heart and a countenance warm and bright as the sun with genuine benevolence,—an unselfish, loving soul, a soul large enough to fill a seraph's bosom,— himself knew nothing of the domestic affections." If Taylor had said that Wesley was singularly unfortunate in his attempts to satisfy the domestic instincts of his nature, no exception could be taken. The Georgia disappointment was followed by a more grievous disappointment, as Grace Murray, partly by her own choice, and partly by the influence of officious friends, broke her engagement with him, and hastily consummated a marriage with one of his preachers; and this was followed by the most grievous affliction of all, an unreasonable and termagant wife. In 1751 he married Mrs. Vazeille, a widow lady of good repute. At first she accompanied him in his work, but soon grew weary of his incessant itinerating, became almost crazed by jealousy, and in fine acted such a part that "she deserves," says Southey, "to be classed in a triad with Xantippe and the wife of Job, as one of the three bad wives." All the evidence goes to show that Wesley treated her with becoming patience and consideration. "Several of his letters to her, which were written after their marriage, have been preserved. They display the utmost tenderness of affection, and justify the opinion that, had it been his happiness to be married to a person that was worthy of him, he would have been one of the most affectionate husbands that ever lived."[1] Taylor was quite out of the way in his estimate of Wesley's domestic aptitudes. There is clear evidence that he was to an extra degree

[1] Jackson, Life of Charles Wesley, p. 441.

responsive to the charms of womanhood. "His early impressibility," says Stoughton, "seen in tender affection for beautiful and gifted sisters, and in warm friendship for the gentler sex, prepared for a lifelong habit of purest sympathy with Christian women."[1]

The grand distinguishing traits of Wesley were consecration, industry, mental alertness, and executive ability. He was intensely devoted. Obstacles the most formidable sank out of sight before his invincible resolution. He was inaccessible both to fear and flattery. His indifference to the verdict of those in high position almost passed over into a species of aversion to people of rank. As he himself states, he cared for no intercourse with persons of quality. He had a very poor opinion of the moral and intellectual character of the more *favored* classes of his own time, and on one occasion exclaimed over the difficulty of being shallow enough for a polite audience.

The amount of work accomplished by Wesley is almost without a parallel. He achieved much, not merely because he was always occupied, but because he was supremely methodical and self-possessed. "Though I am always in haste," he writes, "I am never in a hurry; because I never undertake any more work than I can go through with perfect calmness of spirit." For a long period he travelled annually not less than four thousand and five hundred miles. Besides canvassing England and Scotland, he crossed the Irish channel forty-two times, and spent in the aggregate about six years in that country. Some of his most talented and trusted laborers, such as Thomas Walsh, Adam Clarke, and Henry

[1] History of Religion in England, vi. 112.

Moore, were won in this field. It is estimated that in the course of fifty years he preached upwards of forty thousand times. Besides doing this work he was active in disseminating Christian literature among his people, compiling a library of choice treatises and contributing many volumes of his own productions. He managed, moreover, to secure considerable time for miscellaneous reading. We find him at one time reviewing his studies in Homer; at another, reading a work of Voltaire, or some of the writings of Rousseau; in many instances perusing recently issued works in history and theology.

Wesley was awake to the issues of his day, and in active sympathy with progress in every department. He was interested in scientific discoveries. Franklin's experiments with electricity in particular excited his enthusiasm, and called out the exclamation, "What an amazing scene is here opened, for after ages to improve upon!" He gave his hearty support to the anti-slavery movement, which rose to prominence in his later years, and the last letter which he wrote was to Wilberforce, encouraging him in his philanthropic labors for the slave. He denounced slavery as utterly inconsistent with justice, and fervently implored God to work out the emancipation of the oppressed. "Arise, and help those that have no helper, whose blood is spilled upon the ground like water! Are not these also the work of thine own hands, the purchase of thy Son's blood? Stir them up to cry unto thee in the land of their captivity; and let their complaint come up before thee; let it enter into thy ears! Make even those that lead them away captive to pity them, and turn their captivity

as the rivers in the South." With equal emphasis Wesley denounced the liquor traffic. Words of more terrific energy have scarce ever been uttered against this spoiler of human thrift and happiness than fell from his lips in one of his sermons. Speaking of those who sell for aught but medicinal purposes, he said: "They murder his Majesty's subjects by wholesale, neither does their eye pity or spare. They drive them to hell like sheep, and what is their gain? Is it not the blood of these men? Who, then, would envy them their large estates and sumptuous palaces? A curse is in the midst of them; the curse of God cleaves to the stones, the timber, the furniture of them! The curse of God is in their gardens, their walks, their groves,—a fire that burns to the nethermost hell!"

To some extent Wesley outlived the opprobrium which had been heaped upon him year after year. Many of his opponents ceased from their railings, and the churches, which had been almost entirely closed against him, began to open their doors, so that he received more invitations to preach than he could well accept. In substantial fulfilment of his hope that he might cease at once to work and live, he died March 2, 1791, a week after preaching his last sermon. The victory upon the death-bed was such as befitted the close of a victorious life.

The societies which owned Wesley as their founder were at this time no inconsiderable body. The report for 1790 announces 134,549 Methodist members, of whom 57,631 belonged to America. Among the British Methodists a question of engrossing interest immediately after Wesley's death was naturally their relation

to the Established Church. Every year more and more pressure was brought to bear in the direction of independence. The manner in which the independent status was ultimately reached has been succinctly described as follows: "After a resistance protracted for four years, it was settled by the Conference of 1795 that, where a majority of the stewards and leaders in any society, and also of the trustees of the chapel, desired it, the Lord's Supper might be administered. No society was advised to ask for this. The tone of the Conference to the last was rather dissuasory; but provision was made that society by society, where the members insisted on the sacraments being administered they should be administered. This is all the separation from the Church of England which has ever taken place in Methodism. It took some twenty years to consummate the result. That result was, the ministers finally came to administer the sacrament in every circuit and every society."[1]

5. Results of the Revival. — It is difficult properly to estimate the results of the Methodist revival of the eighteenth century. Isaac Taylor declares that it has "so given impulse to Christian feeling and profession, on all sides, that it has come to present itself as the starting-point of our modern religious history." Speaking of those, perhaps a hundred in number, who were notably connected with the movement, he says: "It would not be easy, or not possible, to name any company of Christian preachers, from the apostolic age downward to our own times, whose proclamation of the

[1] Rigg, The Relations of John Wesley and of Wesleyan Methodism to the Church of England.

gospel has been in a larger proportion of instances effective, or which has been carried over so large a surface, with so much power, or with so uniform a result. No such harvest of souls is recorded to have been gathered by any body of contemporary men since the first century." Similiar testimonies could easily be quoted from a variety of sources.

The Methodist revival rendered incalculable service to the nonconforming sects, by arousing them from their languishing condition, and infusing into them new life and vigor. It rendered also great service to the Established Church. If it created an independent body, it filled it largely from those who had been of no benefit to the Establishment, and were practically strangers to its services; and whatever it took away, it gave therefore an adequate compensation in the spiritual impulses which it imparted. The Evangelical School, which embraced very much of the life and power of the English Church in the closing part of the eighteenth and the first quarter of the nineteenth century, may not have been altogether due to Methodism, but it cannot be denied that it received thence much of its inspiration and means of growth. This school was distinguished by more or less of a Calvinistic bias,—quite positive in Berridge and Romaine, but of a moderate type in the majority. Its ruling interest, however, was practical rather than speculative. Some of its members, as, for example, the two most eccentric, Grimshaw and Berridge, were remarkable for the extent of their labors. As respects the claims of the Established Church, the Evangelicals occupied a liberal position. "They simply regarded her as one of many Protestant commun-

ions. Distinctive Church principles, in the technical sense of the term, formed no part of their teaching."[1] Besides those named above, the Evangelical school included Henry Venn, Walker of Truro, John Newton, the poet Cowper, Thomas Scott, Richard Cecil, Charles Simeon, Joseph Milner, Isaac Milner, and Thomas Robinson of Leicester. Hannah More, and such distinguished laymen as William Wilberforce and the two Thorntons may also be embraced in the list.

A fresh impulse to humanitarian and benevolent enterprise is also to be attributed to Methodism. It was among the pioneers in the organization of Sunday-schools,[2] and in the work of Bible and Tract distribution, and other means of benefiting the ignorant and wretched. "One of the noblest results of the revival," says Green, "was the steady attempt, which has never ceased from that day to this, to remedy the guilt, the ignorance, the physical suffering, the social degradation of the profligate and the poor. It was not till the

[1] Overton, History of the English Church in the Eighteenth Century.

[2] Robert Raikes may be called the founder of Sunday-schools, as the work which he began about 1783 gave a special impulse to the institution of such schools. But, as Tyerman remarks, it deserves to be mentioned that Hannah Ball, a young Methodist lady, had a Methodist Sunday-school at High Wycombe fourteen years before Robert Raikes began his at Gloucester; and that Sophia Cooke, another Methodist, was the first who suggested to Raikes the Sunday-school idea, and actually marched with him at the head of his troop of ragged urchins, the first Sunday they were taken to the parish church. (Life and Times of John Wesley, i. 10, 11.) Wesley's attitude toward the enterprise was cordial from the start. In 1784 he wrote: "I find these schools springing up wherever I go. Perhaps God may have a deeper end therein than men are aware of. Who knows but some of these schools may become nurseries for Christians?" (Ibid., iii. 414, 415.)

Wesleyan impulse had done its work that the philanthropic impulse began."[1]

In the closing part of the century Methodism served as a bulwark against French infidelity and revolutionary zeal. The wildfire was transferred to English soil. The writings of Paine won enthusiastic disciples. Some made a bonfire of their Bibles in honor of their new apostle, and some even got so far beyond the apostle himself that they deliberated whether they ought not to uncitizen him for superstitiously professing some belief in the existence of God. But such opinions made only a measure of headway. "England, on the whole," says Lecky, "escaped the contagion. Many causes conspired to save her, but among them a prominent place must, I believe, be given to the new and vehement religious enthusiasm which was at that very time passing through the middle and lower classes of the people, which had enlisted in its service a large proportion of the wilder and more impetuous reformers, and which recoiled with horror from the anti-Christian tenets that were associated with the Revolution in France."[2]

V.—ENGLISH DISSENTERS.

After the threatening opposition in the reign of Anne, which culminated in the Occasional Conformity Bill, and the Schism Act, had spent its force, the Dissenters enjoyed a fair degree of security. Nevertheless, they made but slow progress toward a legal equality

[1] History of the English People, iv. 273.

[2] England in the Eighteenth Century, ii. 691, 692.

with the members of the Establishment. A serious discrimination was maintained against them through the century. It was not till 1828 that their eligibility to public office was formally acknowledged by the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts. Prior to this date the most notable item of legal indulgence which the government granted was the provision in 1779 that Dissenters, instead of being required to subscribe to the Anglican Articles as a condition of exercising the office of minister or schoolmaster, should simply make a general declaration of their Christian faith. This provision had at the time no application to the Unitarians. Impugners of the doctrine of the Trinity were under the ban of the law till 1813. In practice, however, the law had been for a long interval little else than a dead letter.

The advance of Roman Catholics to a complete legal standing was nearly parallel with that of Protestant Dissenters. In 1778 some of the severer items recorded against them in the statute book were repealed, and in 1829 the completing act of Roman Catholic emancipation in England was accomplished. The indulgence shown at the former date was followed by a disgraceful episode. A combination of demagogism and anti-Romish animosity precipitated a popular outbreak in London, known as the Gordon riot.

An investigation, conducted by Daniel Neal, in 1715–16, lead to the conclusion that there were at that time eleven hundred and fifty congregations of Protestant Dissenters in England and Wales. In this aggregate,—which, as given, is perhaps somewhat too small, —the Presbyterians were the largest factor. It has

been estimated that their congregations were nearly double those of the Independents, as also larger in size, while the congregations of the Baptists, though nearly equal in number to those of the Independents, were inferior in size. The Roman Catholics in England do not appear to have been a numerous body during the eighteenth century. They are said to have reckoned, in 1767, 67,916 adherents; in 1780, 69,376.

The relative superiority of the Presbyterians among English Dissenters was not maintained. Early in the Georgian era they began to decline. Among the principal causes of declension were relaxation of discipline and disintegration of belief. So far was the doctrinal defection carried that before the end of the eighteenth century the Presbyterian name became well-nigh synonymous with Socinian or Unitarian.

The revolt against the Trinitarian teaching, while it specially affected the Presbyterians, did not owe its origin altogether to them. In the closing years of the seventeenth century the enterprising and philanthropic layman, Thomas Firmin, though he remained in the Established Church, was active in spreading Unitarian literature. Whatever effect may have been produced by this kind of agency was supplemented by an ill-managed attempt on the part of several theologians of the Establishment to explicate the mysteries of the Trinity. The attempt ended in mutual accusations of unsoundness. William Sherlock incurred the charge of tritheism, while Wallis and South were accused of Sabellianism. Such charges included no charitable respect for the intent of the writers named. But

shortly afterwards an unmistakable departure from the Trinitarian standard was made by William Whiston. According to Macaulay, "Whiston believed everything but the Trinity." Among the fanciful items of his creed was the belief that the work which passed under the name of the "Apostolical Constitutions" was one of the earliest and most authoritative memorials of primitive Christianity, and indeed of equal value with the four Gospels. Whiston called himself a Eusebian; his opponents called him an Arian. The term Eusebian or Semi-Arian may be granted him, since he did not maintain that the Son was made out of nothing. His heterodoxy caused him the loss of the chair of mathematics which he held at Cambridge. He finally became connected with the General Baptists. A more important contribution to the same, or a very similar class of views respecting the Trinity was made by Samuel Clarke, whose "Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity" was published in 1712. This work was challenged. Clarke managed to satisfy the bishops by a qualifying paper, but many of the clergy were not pleased with his escape. Among the writings called out by the agitation, those of Waterland have earned a wide reputation as an able exposition and defence of Trinitarian teaching.

Partly owing to this ferment, and partly in consequence of the rationalizing spirit of the time, a current was started in the direction of Arianism. A token that this current had entered the domain of the English Presbyterians was first discovered in 1717, when two ministers at Exeter, James Pierce and Joseph Hallett, fell under suspicion. After some local stir,

the subject was brought before the Dissenting clergy of London and vicinity in the famous meeting of Salter's Hall, in 1719. The meeting ended in a breach between the party which insisted upon subscription to a definite Trinitarian formula, and that which rejected subscription. The non-subscribers, so far as the Presbyterian wing of the assembly was concerned, were largely in the majority. Many of them, probably nearly all of them, were by no means anti-Trinitarians. Their opposition was against the requisition of subscription at all. But their position argued at least an absence of dogmatic zeal which, under the existing circumstances, was favorable to an encroaching liberalism. A few decades later only a remnant of the Presbyterian Church in England still adhered to the old faith.

Until the latter part of the century, opposition to Trinitarianism commonly took the form of Arianism. Nathaniel Lardner, who won honorable distinction in the deistical controversy, is understood to have leaned to Arianism. The same was true of Richard Price. Joseph Priestley, on the other hand, advanced to the doctrine of the simple humanity of Christ, and contributed notably toward the transition to this form of Unitarian belief. Theophilus Lindsey and Thomas Belsham, the former coming from the Established Church, and the latter from the Independents, wrought in the same direction. The humanitarian conception of Christ was thus brought into the ascendant. As appears from the Historical Sketch of Lindsey, there was also a tendency decidedly hostile to the early Socinian view that worship is due to Christ, as the representative of God, and as exalted to practical kingship in the things of grace.

369898A

Notwithstanding the large contingent which it received from the Presbyterians, and its accessions from other sources, Unitarianism did not greatly thrive. There was difficulty in retaining ground once acquired. While there were some flourishing congregations, others hardly managed to keep their lease of life. We find Priestley painting the outlook in these discouraging terms: "It is too evident to be denied that the societies of those who are called Rational Dissenters, whether they be properly Unitarian or not, do generally decline, many of them having become actually extinct, and others being in such a condition that they cannot be supported much longer. This is more especially the case in London and in the South of England; but from the same causes it may in time extend to the North."

The Independents, or Congregationalists, adhered more steadily than the Presbyterians to the standards which had been handed down from the preceding generations. In the first half of the century they enjoyed the services of men of such high character, genius, and scholarship as Bradbury, Watts, and Doddridge. Thomas Bradbury was a man of great fearlessness and force, who did not hesitate to take his politics into the pulpit, who felt specially at home on the field of controversy, and who championed orthodoxy with a fiery earnestness. It is scarcely an accident that he came to be spoken of as "bold Bradbury." Isaac Watts was one of the most gifted men of his generation. He was a preacher of more than average eloquence, and an acute, if not eminently profound writer on the topics of

theology and philosophy, as well as a possessor of the divine charism of poesy. Through his talent for sacred song he introduced a new era in the history of English hymnology. "His fancy was as chaste as it was lofty, and was ever held in check by a profound and awful reverence for the character of Almighty God. His errors are, for the most part, errors of style and execution. He had not the musical ear or the delicate critical judgment of Addison. His verse is often faulty in its rhythm, and careless and inaccurate in its rhyme. From its mixed vigor and tameness of thought and expression, it is singularly unequal. But, compared with everything of their kind which had gone before, his hymns must have seemed like the addition of a new sense to the Christian worshipper."[1] Philip Doddridge shared with Watts the honor of sustaining the reputation of Nonconformists for learning and literary ability. His Catholic temper brought him into friendly relations with a great variety of parties. As president of the Academy at Northampton for a score of years, he exercised a widely extended influence. Through his writings, especially the "Family Expositor," and the "Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul," he reached a still larger circle. The latter treatise, though perhaps open to criticism, as presenting a piety that is somewhat too analytic and introspective, has established its claim to high regard by the undeniable fact that it has served as a unique instrument in the conversion of men. While not the equal of Watts in poetic talent, Doddridge wrote hymns whose tender-

[1] H. S. Skeats, History of the Free Churches of England from 1688 to 1851, p. 256.

ness and depth of devotional feeling give them a secure title to immortality. In their origin, his hymns were an appendix to his sermons. "They were flung off with happy facility, each one after he had finished the preparation of his sermon, while his mind was still brimming and kindling with the thought. Each hymn, therefore, preserves the leading ideas of some forgotten sermon." [1]

The period from 1688 to 1800 is named by a Baptist historian "the quiet period" in the annals of his English brethren, not only as being a time of rest from persecution, but also, for the major part, a time of relative inaction. The Arminian branch, the so-called General Baptists, suffered, much like the Presbyterians, from the inroads of Arianism. In protest against this innovation, the more orthodox withdrew in 1770, and formed the New Connection of General Baptists. The body thus organized was destined to be the representative in later times of the General Baptists, the Arianized churches having passed into the Unitarian communion, or become extinct. In the first quarter of the eighteenth century the Arminian Baptists were favored with a learned adherent in the person of John Gale, who is known from his reply to Wall's "History of Infant Baptism."

The Particular, or Calvinistic Baptists, while they contributed so distinguished a member as Robert Robinson to Socinianism, seem to have suffered, on the whole, rather from narrowness than from laxity in dogma. "To whatever other causes," says Cramp,

[1] Stanford, Life of Philip Doddridge.

"the condition of affairs may be ascribed, there can be little doubt that the paralyzing influence of the doctrinal sentiments entertained by many of the ministers, must be regarded as mainly contributing to this result. John Brine and Dr. Gill were chief men in the denomination for nearly half a century. They were supralapsarians, holding that God's election was irrespective of the fall of man. They taught eternal justification. Undue prominence was given in their discourses to the teachings of Scripture respecting the divine purposes. Although they themselves inculcated practical godliness, and so were not justly liable to the charge of Antinomianism, there is reason to fear that numbers of those who imbibed their doctrinal views kept out of sight, or but feebly urged, the obligation of believers to personal holiness. And this is certain, that these eminent men and all their followers went far astray from the course marked out by the Lord and His apostles. They were satisfied with stating men's dangers, and assuring them that they were on the high road to perdition. But they did not call them to repent and believe. . . . And the churches did not, could not, under their instruction, engage in efforts for the conversion of souls. They were so afraid of intruding on God's work that they neglected to do what He had commanded them." [1]

The Methodist revival favorably affected the interests of the Baptists, though they were somewhat slow to manifest the forward impulse. Their annals for the closing part of the century contain two names, Robert Hall and William Carey, which shine as stars of the

[1] Baptist History.

first magnitude. The former has a well-grounded celebrity as one of the great masters of the pulpit, his sermons being at once remarkable for style and for substance. The latter took a conspicuous part in inaugurating the era of enlarged interest in missionary enterprise. Largely through his influence the Baptist Missionary Society was formed in 1792, and the next year he sailed for India. Among those associated with Carey in establishing the Missionary Society, a foremost place in influence was occupied by Andrew Fuller, who besides was eminent as one of the most cogent and thoughtful among the theological writers of his denomination. From Samuel Stennett the Baptists received the precious legacy of hymns which still are voiced in countless sanctuaries.

One of the questions for debate within the denomination was the propriety of open communion. Through the eighteenth century, a large proportion of Baptist ministers seem to have taken the negative side. This side was vigorously championed by Abraham Booth, and was also supported by Andrew Fuller. On the other hand, John Ryland and Robert Hall argued for open communion. The writings of the latter in particular were influential in spreading the conviction among English Baptists that it is not worth while to sacrifice to mere technical consistency both catholicity and consistency of the deeper and better kind.

By the beginning of the eighteenth century the Quakers in England had already passed the meridian as respects the growth of their sect. From this time their chief distinction lay in their forwardness and zeal

in philanthropic enterprises. In 1758 they issued a vigorous protest against the slave trade, and three years later voted to disown any Quakers who might be engaged in the nefarious business. It has been said that by 1780 there was not a single slave in the possession of an acknowledged Quaker. The Quakers also took an honorable part in the work of prison reform. The name of Elizabeth Fry is one of the bright names interwoven with the record of large-hearted and untiring philanthropy in behalf of the wretched prisoner. To be sure, in labors of this kind, she and her co-laborers had been anticipated by John Howard, who began his remarkable tours of prison visitation in 1777; but still an ample field was left for the humanitarian zeal of the Quakers.

VI. — PRINCIPAL DEVELOPMENTS IN SCOTLAND.

In 1712, five years after the legislative union was effected between the English and the Scotch realms, Parliament passed an act destined to be the fruitful cause of disturbance and division in the Church of Scotland. This was the act for the restoration of patronage. The measure was uncalled for and obnoxious to national feeling, a most unfortunate piece of legislative intermeddling. Trouble first began in 1732, when an act supplementary to the law of patronage, which was passed by the Assembly, was protested against by a minority as being a still further encroachment upon the rights of the people in the settling of their pastors. Among those protesting there were four, namely, Ebenezer Erskine, Alexander Moncrief, William Wilson,

and James Fisher, who urged their cause with so much vigor and determination that they earned the displeasure of the Assembly, and finally in 1733 were suspended by the commission of that body from the ministry of the Established Church. Being thus denied what they deemed their rights, and being furthermore inclined to complain of latitudinarian tendencies in the Establishment, they proceeded to form a church of their own, which was known as the Associate Presbytery. Ralph Erskine and others joined with them, and in 1742 they numbered twenty-six ministers. A few years later the Associate Presbytery split into two factions, on the question of taking the burgher oath.[1] In 1820 the two sections came together and formed the United Secession Church. Not very long after the schism headed by Ebenezer Erskine, a second occurred for similar reasons. An obnoxious candidate having been presented by a patron to a parish, the people and the presbytery refused to settle him. The Assembly undertook to deal with the presbytery, and commanded them to ordain the patron's nominee. On their refusal, one of their number, Mr. Gillespie, was deposed (1752). This led to the formation of the so-called Relief Synod, which held the place of an independent Church till 1847, when it was incorporated with the United Secession Church. The whole body is now known as the United Presbyterian Church.

Besides these sects of Scottish Dissenters, another of a different type had its origin in the eighteenth century. From his study of the teachings of the New Testament,

[1] The one taking this oath declared that he professed and allowed with all his heart "the true religion presently professed within this realm and authorized by the laws thereof."

John Glass came to the conclusion that church establishments are inconsistent with the gospel, and in 1727 published a book to that effect. This caused his deposition. A small sect was gathered by him, called Glassites, or Sandemanians, the latter name being derived from Robert Sandeman, the son-in-law of the founder. In pursuance of their literal acceptance of New Testament precedents, the sect insisted upon weekly participation of the eucharist, love-feasts, the kiss of charity on certain occasions, abstinence from blood and things strangled, feet-washings, plurality of elders or pastors in each church, exclusion from the pastoral office of those having been twice married, and liberal sharing with each other of private goods.

The secessions which occurred did not leave the Established Church homogeneous in spirit and policy. Two rival parties continued within its bounds, the one known as the *popular* or *evangelical*, the other as the *moderate* party. Of these the latter was in the ascendant in the eighteenth century, first under the leadership of Patrick Cuming, and then of William Robertson. This party, if not from conviction enthusiastically in favor of patronage, believed in accepting it as the existing law of the Church, and was disposed to grant little indulgence to those who felt themselves aggrieved on this score. Its policy, conceived in a rather arbitrary spirit, had its advantages; but it had also its disadvantages. "It introduced order within the Church. It crushed the revolt of presbyteries. It silenced in many cases popular clamor. But it quietly and gradually alienated masses of people from the Establishment."[1]

[1] John Tulloch, in the St. Giles Lectures.

As the eighteenth century advanced, the rigid spirit of Scottish orthodoxy found itself invaded by more liberal tendencies. There was not a little aversion, however, to departure from old grooves, and some remarkable exhibitions of inveterate prejudice are on record. As late as 1727 a woman was burned for witchcraft, and in 1736 the Associate Presbytery solemnly protested against the repeal, which was then effected, of the laws against witchcraft. It is also recorded that sticklers for old-time customs "denounced in repeated resolutions the legal vacation in December as a national sin, because it implied some recognition of the superstitious festival of Christmas."[1]

Relaxation of dogmatic zeal was especially conspicuous among the so-called Moderates. While expressing no open dissent from the creeds of the Church, they gave to doctrine a secondary place in their spirit and practice, and adopted to a considerable extent in their sermons the moral-essay style so current in England in the early part of the eighteenth century. Their bias is also seen in the fact that their reputation as writers was won mainly in the field of general literature rather than in that of theology. In the former domain they commenced about the middle of the century to acquire an enviable fame. A catalogue of these literary Churchmen has been given as follows: "Beginning with Robert Wallace, author of a 'Dissertation on the Numbers of Mankind in Ancient and Modern Times,' which anticipated Hume's essay on the same subject, and led the way to the later Malthusian speculations, there is a

[1] Lecky, ii. 90; Burton, History of Scotland from 1689 to 1748, ii. 333.

perfect galaxy of distinguished authors to be found in the Scottish Church during the next forty years. Robert Watson, the historian of Philip II.; Adam Ferguson, the historian of Rome; John Home, the author of the tragedy of 'Douglas;' Hugh Blair, the author of the celebrated 'Sermons,' and of the 'Lectures on Rhetoric;' Robert Henry, the philosophic author of the 'History of Great Britain;' and lastly and chiefly, William Robertson, the historian of Scotland, of America, and of Charles V., were all ministers of the Church of Scotland. Add to these Thomas Reid, the well-known head of the Scottish philosophy, and George Campbell, author of the 'Treatise on Miracles,' in reply to Hume, and of the 'Elements of Rhetoric,' and the intellectual picture is still more striking."[1] It seems a little remarkable that out of all this list of writers only the last two appear to have made any definite reply to the sceptical productions of Hume. But perhaps a sufficient explanation may be found in the predominance in these authors of the literary over the dogmatic impulse, and in the manner and character of the unbelieving metaphysician. There was very little in Hume, aside from his bare speculations, to provoke into controversial antagonism. In ordinary intercourse he was remote from the style of the scoffing free-thinker. As Mackenzie remarks, "He had, it might be said, two minds; one which indulged in the metaphysical scepticism which his genius could invent, but which it could not always disentangle; another, simple, natural, and playful, which made his conversation delightful to his friends, and even frequently conciliated men whose principles of

[1] John Tullock, in the St. Giles Lectures.

belief his philosophical doubts, if they had not power to shake, had grieved and offended. During the latter period of his life I was frequently in his company amidst persons of genuine piety, and I never heard him venture a remark at which such men, or ladies, still more susceptible than men, could take offence." [1]

So far as the scope of rational proofs is concerned, Hume's system was thoroughly sceptical. It cast doubt upon the substantial existence of both mind and matter, questioned the validity of the category of causation, and discredited the ability of testimony to establish the fact of miracles. Still, had Hume's writings contained a larger element of reverence for sacred things, it would not be necessary, in spite of his radical propositions, to charge him with a wholesale scepticism. Men of the most believing temper, while magnifying the office of faith or spontaneous sentiment, have sometimes accorded almost as little to the sphere of demonstration as was left to it by Hume. Moreover, it actually appears that Hume gave to sentiment some part of that which he took away from reason. Various passages in his writings indicate a preference for the theistic conception, or the supposition of an intelligent Author of nature. It appears also that he did not mean to challenge unqualifiedly the idea of causation. In a letter, belonging presumably to his later years, we find him writing: "Allow me to tell you that I never asserted so absurd a proposition as that anything might arise without a cause. I only maintained that our certainty of the falsehood of that proposition proceeded neither from intuition nor

[1] Quoted by J. H. Burton, Life and Correspondence of David Hume, ii. 439.

demonstration, but from another source. . . . There are many different kinds of certainty, and some of them as satisfactory to the mind, though perhaps not so regular, as the demonstrative kind."[1] To this may be added the response which Hume gave to Boyle, as the latter intimated that his excessive grief over the death of his mother was due to his lack of religious faith. "Though I throw out my speculations," said the philosopher, "to entertain the learned and metaphysical world, yet, in other things, I do not think so differently from the rest of the world as you imagine."[2]

Some effort was made in the direction of an ecclesiastical censure upon the opinions of Hume. In the General Assembly of 1756 it was moved to appoint a committee to inquire into his teaching. The motion, however, was far from commanding a majority. To the end, Hume lived in friendly relations with the leading clergymen of Edinburgh.

The Philosophy of Common-Sense founded by Thomas Reid, and carried forward by Dugald Stewart and others, served in a measure as an offset to the system of Hume. The distinctive characteristic of this philosophy was its stress upon intuitive beliefs, or those fundamental truths which command the assent of men of sound understanding who attend to them without prejudice. Demonstration, it was maintained, is not needed for this order of truths; being thoroughly agreeable to man's mental constitution, they carry in themselves an adequate sanction.

On the whole, very little of positive heterodoxy came to the surface in Scotland during the eighteenth cen-

[1] Burton, i. 97, 98. [2] Burton, i. 293, 294.

tury. In the early part of the century, Simson, professor of divinity in Glasgow, fell under suspicion of Pelagianism, and in 1729 was suspended from teaching and preaching. Among those who thought his sentence too light was Thomas Boston, one of the "Marrow Men," as they were called. The Erskines were included in the same party. They derived their name from a work which they brought to notice, — a work composed in the time of the Rebellion by an Oxford Puritan, and styled the "Marrow of Modern Divinity." Its tone was the extreme opposite of Pelagianism, and its strong statements on the subject of grace were pushed well-nigh to the border of Antinomianism. The Assembly censured the book. In the latter part of the century some of the Moderates evinced more or less dislike of creed subscription, and a few are supposed to have leaned to Arian or Socinian views. A book written in 1790 by Dr. M'Gill of Ayr, on the death of Christ, incurred the charge of Socinianism, but the author by the help of explanations succeeded in escaping sentence of deposition. Those credited with similar views were styled the "New-light" party, — a designation which appears in the poetry of Burns.

The eighteenth century, in general, was not a time of eminent religious enterprise in Scotland. While something was done to propagate Christian knowledge among the rude and Romanized Highlanders, and a society was organized to this end, there was a general lack of missionary zeal. Church extension was not carried forward, and many sanctuaries were allowed to become dilapidated. The border of the nineteenth century had been passed before practical Christian enterprise began to press forward with worthy strides.

VII. — IRELAND FROM THE REVOLUTION TO THE UNION (1691-1800).

The Revolution left Ireland a conquered country. The hopes which had been awakened during the administration of Tyrconnel, of throwing off English supremacy, rooting up the Protestant interest, and driving the Protestant land-owners out of the country were doomed to bitterest disappointment. The Irish soldiers who marched out of Limerick in 1691, and took ship for France, were right in judging that there was a dismal prospect before their country. "When the wild cry of the women, who stood watching their departure was hushed, the silence of death settled down upon Ireland. For a hundred years the country remained at peace, but it was the peace of despair. No Englishman who loves what is noble in the English temper can tell without sorrow and shame the story of that time of guilt. The work of oppression, it is true, was done, not directly by England, but by the Irish Protestants; and the cruelty of their rule sprang in great measure from the sense of danger and the atmosphere of panic in which the Protestants lived. But if thoughts such as these relieve the guilt of those who oppressed, they leave the fact of oppression as dark as before. . . . The conquered people, in Swift's bitter words of contempt, became 'hewers of wood and drawers of water,' to their conquerors." [1] Full as much indulgence, no doubt, was granted to Irish Romanists as was commonly allowed at the same date to Protestants

[1] Green, History of the English People, iv. 53, 54.

in Roman Catholic countries. Men were burned alive in Portugal and Spain, and hanged in France, on the score of religious opinions and practice, in the first half of the eighteenth century. But oppression in one quarter is no adequate justification for it in another.

Probably nearly three fourths of the population of Ireland at the time of the Revolution were Romanists. The deprivations, therefore, that were effected fell here upon the body of the people, and not upon a mere fragment, as was the case in England. In no less than four respects they were subjected to heavy disabilities before the law; namely, in property, in political rights, in education, and in religious privileges. About a million acres of land were reckoned as forfeited. Restrictions were imposed upon the power of Roman Catholics to acquire real estate, or to bequeath the same according to their choice. Romish parents could be compelled to make allowances for Protestant children. If the eldest son turned Protestant, the estate was attached to him, so that it could not be mortgaged or conveyed by the Romish father. Gun-makers and sword-cutlers must disavow Romanism and engage not to receive Romish apprentices. In any trade, except the linen industry, a Roman Catholic could not have more than two apprentices. On the offer of five pounds he might be compelled to part with his horse. As Romish lawyers were efficient aids in the evasion of these regulations, laws were passed to the effect that no one should act as a solicitor who had not given adequate proof of his Protestantism. Besides these restrictions were others quite as fruitful of misery to the Irish people as any of those mentioned, to the Irish

people as a whole; for the laws by which England sought to protect her products against Irish competition were supremely adapted to impoverish Protestants and Romanists alike. The shipping interest of Ireland was destroyed, and Swift was guilty of slight exaggeration when he said: "The conveniency of ports and harbors, which nature bestowed so liberally on this kingdom, is of no more use to us than a beautiful prospect to a man shut up in a dungeon." [1]

As respects political privileges, the Roman Catholics were little better than aliens in their own country throughout the larger part of the eighteenth century. They were disqualified for office, limited in the exercise of suffrage, and finally excluded from its exercise altogether. They were also barred out of the army and the navy.

Laws were passed excluding Roman Catholics from the University. They could not found schools at home, send their children abroad for education without special permit, act as tutors, or even fulfil the office of guardians. Schools were indeed provided for them after 1733, but these were offensively sectarian in character; in fact, manifestly designed to effect the conversion of those who should partake of their benefits.

As for the Romish religion, the legislation contemplated its speedy extinction. In the reign of William III. it was enacted "that all Popish archbishops, vicars-general, deans, Jesuits, monks, friars, and all other regular Popish clergy, and all Papists exercising any ecclesiastical jurisdiction, should depart out of the kingdom before the 1st of May, 1698, on pain of imprison-

[1] Lecky, History of England in the Eighteenth Century, ii. 227.

ment till transportation; and that, returning after transportation, they should be guilty of high treason. With respect to any Popish ecclesiastics not actually in the kingdom, it prohibited any such to come in, on pain of twelve months' imprisonment, to be followed by transportation, and of high treason if returning after having been transported. Penalties, varying according to the number of times when the offence should be committed, from twenty to forty pounds, and the forfeiture of lands and goods for life, were enacted against any person who should knowingly harbor, relieve, conceal, or entertain such Popish clergy. It was further enacted that no person, upon pain of forfeiting ten pounds, should bury any dead in any suppressed monastery, abbey, or convent that is not made use of for celebrating divine service, according to the liturgy of the Church of Ireland by the law established, or within the precincts thereof. And that all justices of the peace should, from time to time, issue their warrants for apprehending and committing all Popish ecclesiastics whatsoever that should remain in the kingdom contrary to the act; and for suppressing all monasteries, friaries, nunneries, or other Popish fraternities or societies. A statute was also enacted for preventing the mischiefs which had resulted from the intermarrying of Protestants with Papists."[1] In the reign of George II. the law declared marriages of this kind null, and made the priest who should venture to solemnize them liable to hanging.

The above enactments, it will be observed, did not prohibit the secular clergy resident in the country from exercising a large part of their functions, but by exclud-

[1] Richard Mant, History of the Church of Ireland, ii. 73, 74.

ing all influx from abroad, and all increase by new ordinations, it aimed to prevent their having any successors.

In the reign of Anne the resident priests were required to be registered and to subscribe the oaths of allegiance and abjuration, the oaths being so constructed that they were obliged to acknowledge the rightfulness of the existing government as opposed to the claims of the Stuarts, as well as their willingness to accept its rule. Out of upwards of a thousand priests only about thirty complied with these requirements. Those refusing compliance could exercise the priestly office only in secret or by connivance of the authorities.

As the nature of the case dictated, much of this legislation was ineffective. There was no power in Ireland adequate to execute the intolerant statutes against a majority of the people. The laws, no doubt, worked toward the political and social degradation of the Roman Catholics; but so far as they were aimed against their religion they were for the most part a failure. It is recorded, indeed, that about a thousand Roman Catholics, many of whom had considerable fortunes, came into the Established Church between the years 1703 and 1738, and that the number of accessions had risen before the last decade of the century to four thousand and eight hundred. But converts gained by worldly considerations were a poor acquisition, and the paltry influx was vastly outweighed by the bitterness fostered in the great mass who adhered to their old faith. Wesley expressed both the fact and the philosophy of the case when he said, "At least ninety-nine in a hundred of the native Irish remain in the religion of their forefathers. . . . Nor is it any wonder that those who are born Papists generally

live and die such, when Protestants can find no better ways to convert them than penal laws and Acts of Parliament."[1]

The enactments against the presence of the bishops and the monks were never genuinely executed, and soon were openly discarded. Early in the reign of George II. Archbishop King wrote: "The Papists have more bishops in Ireland than the Protestants have, and twice at least as many priests; their priories and nunneries are public; it is in vain to pass laws against them, for the justices of the peace are no ways inclined to put such laws in execution."[2] Before the middle of the eighteenth century the laws designed to limit and ultimately to abolish the practice of the Roman Catholic religion were virtually obsolete. It was not, however, till the latter part of the century that the statute book began to assume a more favorable aspect. A beginning was made in 1778 toward the repeal of discriminations against Romish subjects. Still farther advance was made in 1782 and 1793, though up to 1829 somewhat was still wanting to complete the legal emancipation of Irish Roman Catholics.

The condition of the Romish population was evidently very unfavorable to religious intelligence. An overwhelming majority of the people could neither read nor write. Gross superstitions abounded and found a profuse manifestation, especially in connection with places of pilgrim resort. Not a few of the priests were extremely ignorant. Drunkenness was far from being an unknown vice among them. It makes a curious impression respecting the drinking customs of the times, when

[1] Journal, Aug. 15, 1747. [2] Mant, ii. 471.

we read that a diocesan chapter, wishing to raise a barrier against inebriety, passed a rule to the effect that "no priest in any one place, and at one time, was to drink more than a naggin [two glasses] of whiskey undiluted, or double that quantity in punch." [1]

Among the more noteworthy events in the history of Irish Romanism in the eighteenth century was a declaration of principles prepared toward the end of the reign of George II. by O'Keefe, Bishop of Kildare, and republished in 1792 as an authentic expression of the sentiments of Irish Roman Catholics. It contains among other statements the following: "We have been charged with holding as an article of our belief that the Pope, with or without the authority of a General Council, or that certain ecclesiastical powers, can acquit and absolve us, before God, from our oath of allegiance, or even from the just oaths and contracts entered into between man and man. Now we utterly renounce, abjure, and deny that we hold or maintain any such belief, as being contrary to the peace and happiness of society, inconsistent with morality, and, above all, repugnant to the true spirit of the Catholic religion. We declare that it is not an article of the Catholic faith, neither are we thereby required to believe or profess that the Pope is infallible, or are we bound to obey any order in its own nature immoral, though the Pope, or any ecclesiastical power, should issue or direct such order; but, on the contrary, we hold that it would be sinful in us to pay any respect or obedience thereto." [2] This surely

[1] Killen, Ecclesiastical History of Ireland, ii. 292.

[2] Henry Parnell, History of the Penal Laws; Killen, Eccl. Hist. of Ireland, ii. 279.

collides in some points both with papal practice and Vatican teaching.

Decisions agreeing with the foregoing declaration, at least in part, were near the same time presented from several Roman Catholic Universities. At the instance of Pitt the three following questions had been submitted: "(1) Has the Pope, or have the cardinals, or has any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, any civil authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence whatsoever within the realm of England? (2) Can the Pope or cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, absolve his Majesty's subjects from their oath of allegiance, upon any pretext whatsoever? (3) Is there any principle in the tenets of the Catholic faith by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or other persons differing from them in religious opinions, in any transaction, either of a public or a private nature?" [1] The replies coming from Paris, Douay, Louvain, Alcala, Salamanca, and Valladolid were an explicit negative to each of the questions. These declarations of the learned faculties are interesting as matter of history, though of course, in the absence of any *ex cathedra* signature by the Pope, they are not worth quoting as respects authority.

The penal legislation of the eighteenth century against the Irish Roman Catholics had its parallel in the vexation of Irish Protestants. Though the Episcopalian or Established Church of Ireland numbered scarcely more than one eighth of the population during the century, legislation was shaped with sole reference to its protec-

[1] Parnell, History of the Penal Laws.

tion and interests. If it be granted either that the interests of the Establishment were of higher value than the interests of the people in general, or that they were identical with the same, then possibly one may follow the example of Bishop Mant and justify the whole mass of penal and restrictive laws, down to their most rigorous items, though even then it would be necessary to show that the harsh policy was adapted to the end sought. On any other supposition, no justification can be offered. Especially out of character and reason must appear the disabilities imposed upon Protestant Dissenters, the main body of whom were the Presbyterians in the North of Ireland. Their valor had been a principal means of saving the Protestant interest in Ireland from being overthrown before the machinations of Tyrconnel and his allies. Common humanity would seem to dictate that they should not be sacrificed to the supposed welfare of an Establishment numbering scarcely more adherents than their own ranks; and common-sense would seem to dictate with equal plainness, that in the face of an overwhelming Romish majority, Protestantism ought not to be weakened and held in check by a persecution discouraging the immigration and forcing on the emigration of its stanchest adherents. In fine, one can hardly wish to modify the unbounded denunciations which Froude heaps upon the narrow policy that was pursued. Though the Establishment was far from being a highly effective religious agency, Ireland was governed by it and for it for several scores of years. By a section of an act of Parliament in 1704 the Dissenters were shut out of the government, the holding of any office above the rank of constable

being made dependent upon taking the sacrament according to the rites of the Established Church. After an interval, however, this grievance was modified by the passage of indemnity bills.

Among the various annoyances to which Protestant Dissenters were exposed a peculiarly odious infliction was the obstacle thrown in the way of their marriages being solemnized by their own ministers. After the accession of Queen Anne, "the Presbyterian marriages, hitherto connived at, were declared illegal, and prosecutions were threatened for incontinency. . . . It was announced that the children of all Protestants not married in a church should be treated as bastards, and, as the record of this childish insanity declares, many persons of undoubted reputation were prosecuted in the bishops' courts as fornicators for cohabiting with their own wives." [1] Prosecutions of this sort were forbidden after 1737, but not till the latter part of the century did the law distinctly allow Dissenting ministers to solemnize marriages, and then the concession was made in the face of the protest of the bishops of the Establishment.

The adoption of a more liberal policy toward Dissenters at the close of the eighteenth century does not seem to have been prejudicial to the Established Church. On the contrary, it rose to an improved condition at this very time. "The revival," says Killen, "among the Episcopal clergy, which commenced about the time of the Rebellion of 1798, continued to spread far and wide; so that before the end of the reign of George III. the Irish Establishment contained a considerable number of ministers who, in point of real eloquence and

[1] Froude, The English in Ireland in the Eighteenth Century.

pastoral devotedness, would have adorned the brightest period in the Christian annals. A few of those now awakened became in the end dissatisfied with their Church and withdrew from its communion, but the greater number remained within its pale, and contributed greatly to promote its credit and efficiency. This baptism of grace was experienced by other denominations; and hence, since the year 1800, there has been a general improvement in the state of Irish Protestantism."[1]

At the close of the period the Episcopal Church in Ireland underwent an important change in respect to its constitution. The same Union Bill, of the year 1800, which united in one the Parliaments of England and Ireland consolidated the Church Establishments of the two countries.

Among the distinguished representatives of the Irish establishment in the eighteenth century there were very few who approached Archbishop King, Dean Swift, and Bishop Berkeley in extent of celebrity.

The main body of Presbyterians in Ireland were located in Ulster and connected with the Synod of Ulster. In 1751 this synod reckoned one hundred and fifty-seven congregations.

While the State consented to the persecution of the Irish Presbyterians in one way or another, by a strange inconsistency it contributed toward the support of their ministers. A specific sum of money, the so-called Regium Donum, was conceded, with the exception of a short interval in the reign of Anne, down to the era of disestablishment (1871), when a compensation was al-

[2] Killen, ii. 388, 389.

lowed for the life interest of existing beneficiaries. In the time of William III. the Regium Donum was £1,200; in 1868 it amounted to £40,000.

The liberalism which invaded the Presbyterians of England in the eighteenth century touched in a less degree the Presbyterians of Ireland. A number became restless under the bondage to dogma. "In 1726 twelve ministers with their flocks, constituting what was called the Presbytery of Antrim, were excluded from the general body. The distinctive principle of these separatists was non-subscription to all creeds or confessions."[1] At the same time the views of Simson, the Glasgow professor, were given more or less currency through the agency of those who had studied at the Scotch University.

From the time that Wesley invaded Ireland in 1747 the Methodist evangelists pressed forward with characteristic ardor and with characteristic experiences of opposition and mob violence. If the apparent results upon Irish soil were less ample than in some other quarters, it was because of special obstacles. Not to mention the difficulty of contending with a predominant Romanism, enforced in the hearts of the people by political as well as by religious prejudices, the growth of the Methodist societies was repeatedly hindered or wholly stopped by the extensive emigration of their members. The number reported as connected with the Irish Conference in 1813, namely, 28,770, may be regarded as expressing about the maximum of membership which has at any time been reached. Three or four years later the Conference was much weakened by a schism which

[1] Killen, ii. 232.

resulted in consequence of a vote to concede the sacraments to the societies. Very few of the ministers joined the schismatics, but several thousands of the people, including not a few of the wealthier class, united to form a body of "Primitive Methodists" on the principle of perpetual adherence to the Established Church.

As already noted, Ireland contributed to Wesley such distinguished co-laborers as Thomas Walsh, Adam Clarke, and George Moore. In the closing years of the eighteenth and the early part of the present century a place of peculiar honor in the annals of Irish Methodism was won by Gideon Ousely. A man of good family and education, having a courageous heart, blessed with a good share of mother wit, and deeply sympathizing with the poor people, he was eminently qualified for successful work in his chosen vocation as a missionary at large. Many a tribute of esteem and admiration was gained by him from his Romish auditors whom he addressed in the Irish tongue.

CHAPTER II.

AMERICA IN THE COLONIAL ERA.

I. — THE COLONIES IN THEIR POLITICAL RELATIONS.

SCARCELY had Columbus brought back the news that the waters of the Atlantic laved accessible lands in the distant west before full provision was made for the ownership of the new regions. Alexander VI., though one of the most unsavory among the ecclesiastical potentates who have had their seat in Rome, felt no hesitation about portioning out the planet according to his discretion. He seemed in fact to possess a fully average consciousness of what is implied in being heir to the immeasurable wealth of Peter. By a bull issued May 4th, 1493, he ordained that countries which should be discovered a hundred leagues or more to the west of the Azores and Cape Verde Islands should fall to Spain.[1] The following year the papal gift was modi-

[1] Lands actually possessed by any other Christian power up to the time of the first discovery by Columbus, were excepted from the grant to Spain. All other lands within the defined limits, whenever and however they might be discovered, were to fall to the Spanish sovereigns, as appears from the following language of the bull: Motu proprio, non ad vestrum vel alterius pro vobis super nobis oblatæ petitionis instantiam, sed de nostra mera liberalitate, et ex certa scientia, ac de apostolicæ potestatis plenitudine, omnes insulas et terras firmas inventas et inveniendas,

fied, in that the dividing line was placed three hundred and seventy leagues to the west of the Cape Verde Islands. The bull of Alexander VI. was of course made out in the dark. No one at that time had anything like an accurate knowledge of the earth's surface. Nevertheless so far as America is concerned, the Pope, as a Spaniard, could not better have satisfied his partiality for his native land had he acted in the light. Only a section of Brazil was located east of the line which he drew in the plenitude of his authority. To the rest of the two continents Spain held the title.

The papal parchment was doubtless a convenient thing for Spain. Still the real basis of her success in the New World was her own enterprise. She pushed forward energetically in the project of discovery and occupation. Herein she preceded France and England

detectas et detegendas versus Occidentem et Meridiem fabricando et construendo unam lineam a Polo Arctico, scilicet Septentrione, ad Polum Antarcticum, silicet Meridiem, sive terræ firmæ et insulæ inventæ et inveniendæ sint versus Indiam aut versus aliam quamcumque partem, quæ linea distet a qualibet insularum quæ vulgariter nuncupantur de los Azores y cabo vierde, centum leucis versus Occidentem et Meridiem, ita quod omnes insulæ et terræ firmæ repertæ et reperiendæ, detectæ et detegendæ, a præfata linea versus Occidentem et Meridiem per alium regem aut principem Christianum non fuerint actualiter possessæ usque ad diem nativitatis Domini Nostri Iesu Christi proximi præteritum, a quo incipit annus præsens millesimus quadringentesimus nonagesimus tertius, quando fuerunt per nuntios et capitanos vestros inventæ aliquæ prædictarum insularum, auctoritate omnipotentis Dei nobis in beato Petro concessa, ac vicariatus Jesu Christi, qua fungimur in terris, cum omnibus illarum dominiis, civitatibus, castris, locis, et villis, juribusque et jurisdictionibus apertinentiis universis, vobis hæredibusque et successoribus vestris (Castellæ et Legionis regibus) in perpetuum tenore præsentium donamus, concedimus, et assignamus. Vosque et hæredes ac successores præfatos illarum dominos cum plena, libera, et omnimoda potestate, auctoritate et jurisdictione, facimus, constituimus, et deputamus.

by the breadth of a century. Before they had ceased merely to dream of transatlantic possessions, she had extended her rule to a continental range.

The beginning of a permanent settlement in the West Indies was made during the second visit of Columbus (1493–1496), at which time he planted a colony upon the island of Hispaniola or Hayti. In the succeeding years the other principal islands of the group were occupied. Possession was taken of Cuba in 1511.

Darien served as the first permanent foothold upon the main land. A settlement was begun there in 1510. Three years later Vasco Nuñez crossed the Isthmus and won the distinction of being the first European to gaze upon the Pacific. In 1519, by the founding of Panama, Spain secured an advantageous position on the western coast.

From the Isthmus the tide of conquest rolled both northward and southward. In the former direction it met the impetuous wave which had been started by Hernando Cortés, whose splendid piracy had won the Aztec empire for the Spanish crown (1519–1521). Central America was thus in large part brought under the sword. While its subjugation was in progress the avaricious thirst of the Spaniards was excited by rumors of an empire in the south, where the accumulated treasures of a civilized people presented a prize rivalling that which had fallen to the conquerors of Mexico. Here was a chance for a master-stroke in brigandage, and Francisco Pizarro, a man rivalling Cortés in daring and hardihood, but inferior in culture and magnanimity, was ready to improve the chance. After spending some years in preliminary expeditions, he sailed from Panama

for the conquest of Peru in 1531. The same order of tactics which had triumphed over Montezuma in Mexico speedily sufficed to overthrow the power of the Inca ruler. The fabulous heap of gold gathered for his ransom only served to line with a brilliant mockery his way to the scaffold.

Peru supplied a vantage ground for further conquests. An attack upon Chili was undertaken as early as 1535. It was not, however, till a few years later that any substantial acquisition was made in that direction; and then the work of subjugation was incomplete. The advance into southern Chili was held in check by the Araucanians. This hardy people withstood successfully all efforts to subdue them, and still had the courage in the eighteenth century to match arms several times with the Spaniards.

Simultaneously with the advance into Chili the districts toward the north were invaded. Quito was captured in 1533, and the city of Bogota was founded in 1538.

Meanwhile settlements were being effected from the eastern side of the continent. Spanish vessels, bearing a company of colonists, entered the La Plata in 1534, and two or three years later the first permanent settlement in Paraguay, or the La Plata basin, was begun at Asuncion. The continuous history of Buenos Ayres dates from 1580, though its primary foundation was forty-five years earlier.

To the north of Mexico Spanish conquest did not advance so rapidly as in the regions to the south of the Isthmus. The country with its wild tribes appeared in general less inviting. Considerable interest, however,

was awakened at quite an early date in New Mexico, where the Pueblo Indians exhibited, if not so advanced a civilization as that of the Mexicans and Peruvians, still a state noticeably above sheer barbarism. The first regular expedition into New Mexico, which occurred under Coronado in 1540, did not result in the occupation of the country. Fifty years or more elapsed before a settlement was made; and this can hardly be described as permanent, since an uprising of the natives in 1680 either destroyed or swept away every Spaniard in the province. Twelve years later a reconquest was effected.

In Lower California, California, and Texas, Spanish colonization was scarcely more than a means of planting and sustaining missions. The first of these countries witnessed the beginning of a permanent settlement in 1697, the second in 1769, and the third in 1714. Texas had been entered at an earlier date. Aside from the visits of individual missionaries and travellers, a formal attempt to plant a colony is recorded for the year 1690; but this proved to be so unpromising that it was soon abandoned.

Florida also was never largely occupied by the Spaniards. The first expeditions to the country ended in utter disaster. Instead of the looked-for paradise, the invaders found hunger, disease, and the grave. The real settlement of the country was not begun till 1565, when Menendez founded St. Augustine on the eastern coast. About one hundred and thirty years later (1696) Pensacola was founded in western Florida. A few other settlements were started; but the country was rather garrisoned than occupied. The Spanish popula-

tion is supposed not to have exceeded six or seven thousand when the province was surrendered to Great Britain (1763); and its return to Spanish control twenty years later was probably not followed by a sufficient influx to make up for the deficit in the Spanish element which had resulted from the foregoing evacuation.

In the theory of Spain, as in that of other European powers who acquired territory in America, her colonies ranked as attachments to the crown. Proprietorship in the full sense pertained to the sovereign. He held the primary title to the land, and those who settled upon it were counted as subjects of his unrestricted rule.

The more immediate instrument for exercising the royal pleasure in relation to the colonies was the Council of the Indies. This council, which had its seat at Madrid, possessed supreme jurisdiction over every department of colonial administration. The appointment of officials and the origination of the laws by which they were to be guided fell alike within its province.

In the early stages of discovery and conquest captains-general and governors were the foremost officers in the new settlements.[1] But as great populations were brought into subjection the system of viceroys was introduced. Privileged with not a little of royal state and holding the chief executive power over a vast stretch of territory, the viceroy enjoyed a sort of princely dignity. In his accountability, however, and his liability to recall, he was made to recognize that he still remained in the

[1] The title of viceroy may have been used in connection with Columbus, but the vice-regal function as a regular and permanent feature of colonial administration was introduced later.

relation of subject and servant. The first to be appointed viceroy was Mendoza, who was installed in Mexico in 1535. For a considerable time, Lima, the capital of Peru, was the only rival of Mexico in the honors of viceroyalty, the one being the governmental centre of the provinces to the south of the Isthmus, and the other of those to the north. But in 1718 a third viceroyalty was instituted at Santa Fé de Bogota, and in 1776 a fourth was erected at Buenos Ayres. During most of the colonial era all the provinces were regarded as under the supervision of one viceroy or another. In some regions, however, located at a distance from the seat of the viceroy, his authority was scarcely more than nominal.

Next to the chief executive the most notable authority was the audiencia. This in its central function was a judicial tribunal. But its prerogatives extended somewhat beyond the mere consideration of questions and suits at law, so that its authority served in a measure to limit that of the viceroy. At the height of colonial expansion there were twelve of these tribunals distributed through the provinces.

The conviction that colonies ought above all things to enrich the mother country, in conjunction with the narrow commercial system which dominated the age, led Spain to impose upon the trade and industries of her American States a most damaging and oppressive system of restriction. Everything needed by the colonies had to be imported from the mother country. Trade with foreigners was even reckoned among capital offences. As for inter-colonial traffic, it was either grievously hampered with restrictions or entirely prohibited.

These restraints, together with a constant burden of taxation, though amounting to a grievance appreciably greater than that which fired the resentment of the English colonies, seemed for a long time to awaken no serious alienation or thought of rebellion. But at length the ambition for freedom and self-government awoke throughout the length and breadth of the Spanish dependencies. The temporary usurpation by Napoleon over the crown of Spain, though resented by the colonies in the first instance, interrupted their connection with the mother country, and prepared them finally to think that they could dispense with the rule of a distant monarch, whether in or out of the regular line. At the same time, the example of the independence and rising prosperity of the Anglo-American States stimulated their courage. The result was that between 1810 and 1822 the standard of revolt was everywhere raised and everywhere carried forward to victory, — in Hayti, or such portion of it as still remained under Spanish rule, in Mexico, in Central America, and in the various provinces of South America. The dependencies of Mexico to the north, as they still continued in connection with her, shared her new political status. Accordingly, since Spain ceded Florida to the United States in 1819, she held in 1822 only the merest fragment of the magnificent domain beyond the Atlantic, over the greater part of which she had ruled for nearly three centuries.[1]

The era of Portuguese colonization in Brazil dates from the year 1531. The country had indeed been vis-

[1] Among the works found serviceable in preparing the preceding outline, special mention may be made of H. H. Bancroft's "History of the Pacific States," and R. G. Watson's "Spanish and Portuguese South America."

ited earlier by the explorer and the trader; but it was then that the government began in earnest to encourage occupation. While a vast stretch of territory in the interior remained untouched, a tolerably continuous line of settlements extended along the coast by the end of the seventeenth century.

At the initial stage of occupation hereditary captaincies were bestowed upon a number of persons, giving them unrestricted rule over the districts which they undertook to colonize. This arrangement seemed to be too favorable to the despotic instincts of the captains, and in answer to complaints the country was placed under a governor-general in 1549. Between 1580 and 1640 Brazil, sharing the fortune of the mother country, was under the crown of Spain. Before the close of this interval the Dutch had succeeded in gaining a foothold. They were not allowed, however, to enjoy their acquisitions for more than the space of a generation.

The great European upheaval under Napoleon affected Brazil as well as the Spanish dependencies. For a time the unique spectacle was witnessed of the throne being transferred from the European to the American side. On the return of the King to Portugal, Brazil declared for independence (1822–23). But while a separate monarchy was erected, the ruler was taken from the family of the sovereign to whom allegiance had previously been rendered. The house of Braganza still held the sceptre.

In the earlier attempts of the French to colonize America the Huguenots took a conspicuous part. Their

great leader Coligny, interested at once to extend the domains of France and to provide an asylum for his co-religionists, gave his encouragement to several expeditions. In the first of these Brazil was the objective point, and a settlement was effected upon an island in the harbor of Rio Janeiro in 1555. Its history was a brief chapter of disasters. Weakened by the faithless conduct of its leader, Villegagnon, who began to persecute the Protestants in the little community, it fell an easy prey to the jealous Portuguese (1558).

A darker fate still befell the settlement in Florida. The small company left in the country in 1562 abandoned their post the next year, to endure upon the sea the combined horrors of famine and exposure in a crazy and unseaworthy craft. The larger community, composed mainly of Huguenots, which was settled on the St. John's river in 1564 and 1565, encountered a foe more merciless than famine and storm. The sword of a Spanish bigot cut off the greater part of them in one of the most cold-blooded massacres which have been perpetrated on this continent. The French commander, the brave and able Ribaut, fell with the rest. Menendez, the agent of the atrocity, took pains to mix his religion with the deed, representing that the butchery was a suitable treatment of an evil and accursed sect. Philip II., it is hardly necessary to state, was well pleased with the work of his subordinate. A despatch to Menendez bore this endorsement, supposed to be in the handwriting of the king: "Say to him that, as to those he has killed, he has done well; and as to those he has saved, they shall be sent to the galleys." To Pius V. also the massacre was no offence. If he did not for-

mally approve it, he did approve its author, addressing him a few years later in very flattering terms as "a much-beloved and dear son in Christ."[1]

Meanwhile there were Roman Catholics in France who were disposed to regard the work of Menendez as a crime against Frenchmen, and not merely a deserved infliction upon heretics. One of these, Dominique de Gourgues, had the hardihood to plan and to execute (1568) a terrible reprisal upon the Spanish garrisons which had taken the place of the Huguenot colony.[2]

The proper era of French colonization began about forty years from the destruction of the settlement in Florida. After sending her fishermen for a century to the northern waters, France at length concluded that it was worth while to occupy some portion of the vast domain which had been discovered. Beginning in Acadia, or Nova Scotia, the bearers of the French standard passed up the St. Lawrence to Quebec and Montreal; then penetrated through the lake region, and finally advanced through the Mississippi valley to the Gulf of Mexico. It was in 1682 that the intrepid La Salle, by pushing his boat into the waters of the Gulf, solved the mystery of the great river. By the end of the century the settler had followed the explorer. France stood sentinel at the mouth of the Mississippi as well as at

[1] Parkman, Pioneers of France in the New World; Fairbanks, History of Florida; Charlevoix, History of New France (Shea's translation).

[2] That Spanish writers should wish to call Gourgues a "heretic" is explained by their abhorrence of the man. We regard the declaration of Charlevoix, that he never forsook the ancient faith, as deserving much greater credit. Ferland follows Charlevoix, as is seen in his Cours d'Histoire du Canada, i. 55.

the mouth of the St. Lawrence. Her claims covered the heart of the continent.

Huguenot patronage had its share in this later enterprise which created a New France, as well as in the abortive efforts at colonization which had preceded. It was under the patent which the Huguenot De Monts obtained from Henry IV. that the oldest permanent settlement of the French in America was effected (1605), that of Port Royal — now Annapolis — in Acadia.[1] It was also under the auspices of De Monts that Champlain established a colony at Quebec in 1608. New France, however, was not destined to be a home or refuge for the Huguenots. Their worship was soon put under the ban, and they were given to understand that in the American domains of the "Very Christian King" only savages and orthodox Romanists were to be tolerated. In the period of the dragonnades tens of thousands went to other countries, but none were admitted through the barred gates of Canada and Louisiana. This exclusion, for the time being, saved the minds of the untutored Indians from being infected with Calvinistic heresy; but the ultimate result of the intolerant policy was not so happy, since thereby the country was made a ready prey to the Protestant rule of Great Britain. Thus have judged some of the French Canadians themselves. Speaking of the period of the great exodus in the reign of Louis XIV., Garneau remarks: "What a mighty advantage would have accrued to New

[1] This is reckoned as the oldest settlement. It should be noticed, however, that it was abandoned temporarily (1607–1610), though the buildings were left standing and were reoccupied on the return of colonists.

France, if a licensed emigration of the Protestant population of Old France had taken place, at this time, to Canada and the newly explored regions of the West! Other inimical and rival countries had not then been enriched and strengthened by what the French nation thus lost, both in contemporary and coming times; nor had we, Gallo-Canadians, been reduced to defend foot to foot, against an alien race, our language, our laws, and our nationality."[1] The French colonies in their early stage were little more than appendages to trading companies. They were frontier posts subordinate to the convenience and profit of those who had the monopoly of the trade in peltries. The cultivation of the land was a secondary consideration, and but little pains were taken to foster the growth of the population.

Even to the end of the French jurisdiction the fur trade held an unhealthy pre-eminence, and the population remained miserably inadequate to defend so broad a stretch of territory. But in time efforts began to be made to reinforce the settlements and to place them upon a better basis. In 1663 we find the Governor of Canada advising the King to send a large body of soldiers into the province, who, after being employed in subduing the Iroquois and driving the Dutch out of New York, should be given lands and settled in the country.[2]

This scheme in its full extent was not attempted. But from that time the French government felt the necessity of building up and extending the colonies. As

[1] History of Canada, i. 272 (Bell's translation).

[2] Parkman, The Old Régime in Canada.

the emigration to New France rarely took place by families, shiploads of maidens were sent out from time to time, and the unmarried settlers were well-nigh coerced into a selection of wives, very considerable deprivations being imposed upon those who dared to defy sovereign authority and to remain single.

As an encouragement to the occupation of land a species of feudalism was transplanted to Canada. Large domains were granted to such as would promise to improve them within a given time. To meet this condition, the seignior, or holder of the grant, was under constraint to parcel out his lands among a number of tenants, who paid him a moderate rent, and acknowledged certain legal obligations to him, such as patronizing his mill, and setting apart for him a percentage of the fish caught in waters bordering his domain. In the more trivial causes the seignior had judicial power over his tenants. But this prerogative appears not to have been much exercised, and as the seignior himself was directly amenable to the colonial government, he had little of the relative independence which pertained to the feudal lord in mediæval times. The system survived the transition to British rule. Down to the year 1854 many estates in Canada were held under feudal tenure.

In the colonial administration the chief officials were the governor-general and the intendant. The latter exercised important judicial functions, and besides served the king as a kind of spy upon the governor. These two, in conjunction with a few councillors, had the whole control of affairs.

The general cast of government was that of a paternal

absolutism. Popular sovereignty was entirely ignored. A fair degree of nursing was expended on the people. They received, however, no training in the faculty of self-rule. The exigencies of their position made them hardy soldiers; but in the qualities which are needed for a free, durable, and progressive commonwealth, their English neighbors were rapidly outstripping them.

In advancing to the possession of the great waterways, France seemed to be grasping the keys of the continent. Before the construction of railroads such means of communication were of immense import. But there were great obstacles in the way of following up the advantage. The hostility of the Iroquois, early provoked by the alliance of Champlain with their enemies, not only raised a formidable barrier in the direction of the Hudson, but carried back a tide of desolation into Canada. Then again, as has been indicated, colonization was not fostered on a scale at all comparable with the national opportunity. At the middle of the eighteenth century the English colonists outnumbered the French ten to one, and during most of the previous part of their history the ratio was doubtless equally unfavorable. To offset the disparity the French put forth special efforts to gain the alliance of the Indian tribes. Their missionaries were continually utilized to this end. Considerable success rewarded their pains; but it was a kind of success which worked toward future overthrow. The undisguised way in which the French colonists spurred on, and co-operated with, the savages in their murderous raids upon the New England towns enkindled a deep animosity, and begot the conviction that the con-

quest of Canada was a necessary antecedent to peace and security.[1]

The first great step toward the conquest was made in 1710. At this time Acadia, which had previously been taken and restored at intervals, was taken to be permanently retained. By the treaty of Utrecht in 1713 this region was surrendered to England, together with Newfoundland and the Hudson Bay territory. A little more than forty years later (1755) the French element in Acadia was much reduced by the forced embarkation of some thousands, and their distribution among the Eng-

[1] Apologists for the Canadians have been inclined to allege that the English in New York instigated the Iroquois to the great massacre which took place at La Chine and its neighborhood in 1689. The allegation is not unnatural. There can be no doubt that the New Yorkers, at one time and another, took pains to foster in the Iroquois a hostile attitude toward the French and their allies. But with this massacre they had no responsible connection. The immediate cause of the atrocity was the treachery of a Huron chief, the Rat, who wished to break off the treaty between the French and the Iroquois, as being dangerous to the Hurons. No document verifies the accusation against the English in New York, and it is moreover opposed by known facts. Parkman says: "I find nothing in contemporary documents to support the accusation. Denonville wrote to the minister, after the Rat's treachery came to the light, that Andros had forbidden the Iroquois to attack the colony. Immediately after the attack at La Chine, the Iroquois sachems, in a conference with the agents of New England, declared that 'we did not make war on the French at the persuasion of our brethren at Albany; for we did not so much as acquaint them of our intention till fourteen days after our army had begun their march.'" (Count Frontenac and New France under Louis XIV.) But even if New York, acting without concert with the New England authorities, had been guilty in this instance, it would not have justified the sacking of peaceful hamlets in Massachusetts and Maine. That some of the missionary priests were immediately engaged in urging on these cruel raids is far from being a feature of relief.

lish colonies.[1] In 1763, the valor of Montcalm, having failed to save Quebec, the whole of Canada passed under British rule, together with a large share of French territory to the south of the lakes. As, at the same time, Louisiana, including the great region of the Mississippi valley, west of the river, was ceded to Spain, France completely relinquished her empire in the western world. Louisiana, it is true, was restored to France in the time of the first Napoleon, but it was only to be passed over at once to the United States for a specified sum. This occurred in 1803.

In acquiring Canada, England obtained a province that was loyal enough after a fashion, but one nevertheless that refused to be anglicized. From that time to this the French Canadians have shown a singular indisposition to be anything else than French Canadians. Immediately after the conquest it seems to have been

[1] This violent dealing cannot be justified. The expulsion of the Acadians, in the manner in which it was accomplished, was a cruel deed. At the same time there is a poor excuse for inserting the fancies of the poet in the place of history, and depicting the Acadians as a harmless, innocent folk who gave no occasion for the blow that fell upon them. Before the English occupation they had not exhibited a specially peaceable and exemplary disposition. After the transfer of their country to England, they were disposed to claim the neutral position which was conceded to them for a time, as a finality, and refused to take the unconditional oath of allegiance. "There can be no room to doubt," says Beamish Murdock, "that such a neutrality as had been suffered but never sanctioned by the British crown was wholly incompatible with its just rights of sovereignty." (History of Nova Scotia, ii., 287. Compare C. C. Smith in Critical and Narrative History of America, vol. v.) Parkman, while confessing the harshness of a measure which punished the innocent with the guilty, does not hesitate to say that "many of the sufferers had provoked their fate, and deserved it." (Count Frontenac and New France, p. 190.)

presumed that they might be treated in all respects as British subjects, and English law was declared to be in force in the province. But it was found impracticable to make so great a transition on the instant. By the Quebec Act of 1774 French laws were allowed to rule in questions of property and civil rights, while English law was to apply in criminal cases. At the same time Roman Catholics were granted the right to practise their religion and to levy tithes upon themselves for its support. By the constitution of 1791 a still further concession was made to the French element, in that a division was effected between Lower and Upper Canada, and each province was allowed to have its own legislature. As the French greatly preponderated in Lower Canada, this arrangement was agreeable to their preference for a separate and distinct position.

The overthrow of French rule on the St. Lawrence doubtless prepared the way for the overthrow of British rule in the regions to the south. Being relieved of the presence of an aggressive rival the colonies of English descent felt free to present a bold front to the mother country in demanding what they esteemed to be their rights. They could now contend with England without incurring the danger of falling into the hands of France. Some of the French statesmen of the era were keen enough to see the probable course of events, and to predict the revolution which followed so speedily upon the retirement of their nation from its colonial possessions.[1]

English colonization ran parallel with the French. Two years after De Monts had settled Annapolis, and

[1] Bancroft, History of the United States, ii. 564; iii. 75.

one year before Champlain had founded Quebec, the nucleus of a rival dominion had been provided at Jamestown in Virginia (1607).

In each case alike success was preceded by disaster. The colony which Sir Walter Raleigh planted at Roanoke (1585–1590) was as completely swept away as the Huguenot settlement in Florida had been twenty years earlier. Nor was the patron of the English enterprise more happy in his personal fortunes than the pioneers of French colonization. While the sword of Menendez shed the blood of Ribaut, and Coligny fell a victim to royal jealousy and religious fanaticism, Raleigh was kept in prison for many years, and finally sent to the block by the mean-spirited James I.

The energy and genius of Raleigh kindled a spirit of enterprise in Richard Hakluyt and others, that issued in 1606 in an organized effort to secure for English rule the middle portion of the continent, which then was called Virginia. In response to a petition for this end, King James granted in that year a patent for the territory between the 34th and 45th degrees of latitude. The patentees, while subject to the instructions of the crown, were invested with a general superintendence over the country to be settled. They were expected to form two colonies, one in the southern and another in the northern part of their grant. The patentees connected with the former project came to be designated as the London Company, and it was under their auspices that a settlement was effected at Jamestown.

The adventurers or patentees for the northern colony did not meet with so speedy a success. The colony planted by Popham at the mouth of the Kennebec

(1607, 1608) had but a brief existence. The earliest permanent settlement in New England, that at Plymouth in 1620, did not in strictness take place under the authority of either of the English companies. While the Pilgrims obtained their patent from the London Company, they settled where it had no validity, New England being outside of the jurisdiction of that company.

The same year that the Pilgrims landed a reorganization of the adventurers of the Northern Colony of Virginia was effected. As newly constituted the company was called the "Council established at Plymouth, in the county of Devon, for the planting, ruling, ordering, and governing of New England in America." It was under a grant from this Council for New England that the Puritan colony of Massachusetts Bay made their settlement in 1628 and the following years. The Pilgrims at [New] Plymouth secured themselves in the possession of their district by a patent from the same source (1621, 1630). The claims of Ferdinando Gorges to territories in Maine rested likewise primarily upon grants from the Council for New England (1622, 1635), as did also those of John Mason and his heirs to the region of New Hampshire (1621, 1622, 1635). The Connecticut colony (1635, 1636) was an overflow from the large Puritan population which had emigrated to Massachusetts Bay, and its principal settlements on the Connecticut river were made under the protection of the older colony. But it was deemed prudent to found a claim upon a patent which was understood to have emanated from the Council of New England, and which passed from the Earl of Warwick to Lord Say and Sele.

The New Haven colony, founded in 1638, and the Providence and Rhode Island plantations (1636, 1638) held their lands in the first instance by purchase from the Indians, and depended for continuous possession upon the sanction or connivance of the crown.

In actual settlement New England may be regarded as having been in advance of New York. For while the Dutch kept up a connection with the region of the Hudson after its discovery in 1609, for a number of years they employed no other means of occupation than the establishment of trading-posts. It was first in 1623, under the auspices of the West India Company, which had been chartered by the States General two years previously, that an agricultural colonization was seriously attempted. Even from that date the influx was not rapid. The population of New Netherland was small compared with that of New England when in 1664 it passed under English rule.

After New England, Maryland was the next theatre of a permanent English settlement. The patent which assigned the country to George Calvert (Lord Baltimore) was prepared in 1632. Before it passed the great seal Sir George died. The patent, however, remained intact to his son Cecil, and under its provisions Maryland was settled in 1634.

The royal grant which bestowed the Carolinas upon a company of English gentlemen dates from the year 1663. Shortly before this time the northern part of the Carolina coast, or the Albemarle region, had begun to be occupied by emigrants from Virginia. In 1665 a settlement was made on Cape Fear River. Five years later a colony was established in South Carolina. In

1680 Charleston became the chief seat of this branch of the Carolina province.

New Jersey became a field for English settlement at about the same time as Carolina. During the preceding years it had been reckoned by the Dutch as a part of New Netherland, and in 1655 they had given a practical indication of a disposition to sustain their claim by bringing into subjection the Swedish colony which had been planted on the Delaware seventeen years before. Accordingly when the Dutch surrendered their possessions to the English, New Jersey was transferred along with New York (1664). It was, however, at once made a separate province, or rather two provinces. By grant of the Duke of York, to whom the whole territory of New Netherland had been consigned, the Jersey portion was divided between Sir George Cartaret and Lord Berkeley. Under their patronage an English population began forthwith to be established in the country.

Pennsylvania was given to William Penn in 1681 in payment of a debt which the crown had incurred to his father, Admiral Penn. The next year the newly constituted province, which afforded a welcome asylum to the Quakers, received the first company of colonists. The territory constituting the present state of Delaware was reckoned in the grant of Penn. After 1703 it had its own legislative assembly, though continuing under the proprietary of Pennsylvania.

The founding of Georgia was the latest example of English colonization (the temporary occupation of Florida excepted) in this country. In its motive it was one of the most worthy in the list of colonial enterprises. As devised and conducted by Oglethorpe it was

designed to provide a refuge for imprisoned debtors, whose incompetency was rather their misfortune than their crime, as also for other classes of the unfortunate or oppressed. The charter for the colony was granted in 1732, and early in the following year the settlement at Savannah was begun.

In considering the political status of the English colonies one is struck with the manifest contrast which they present to the Spanish and the French communities in America. While in theory the first were as truly appendages of the crown as the others, the offspring of its grants and the immediate subjects of its unrestricted sovereignty, they were in fact very differently circumstanced. They exhibited in their political condition a variety, a movement, and a freedom not to be found in the Spanish or the French dependencies. These traits, especially in the earlier portion of the colonial period, were due in part to the procedure of the English government, — to the measure in which it left the management of the American settlements to patentees and colonists. But from the first it was due also in part to the character of the colonists. Their independent spirit in no small proportion of instances was the motive to emigration, and that spirit was not likely to lie dormant in the free air of the wilderness. It grew and throve, so that when the English government was ready to lay a stricter hand upon the colonies, it was found that they could not be moulded at will. Where outward conformity was rendered to the requisitions of throne or parliament, a spirit of independence was still manifest back of the conformity.

Three different forms of government were represented

in the colonies, — the charter, the proprietary, and the royal. Several of the colonies had experience of two different forms, since the cancelling of a charter or of a proprietary right brought in the direct control of the crown.

New England was the proper theatre of the charter governments. Virginia, it is true, was settled under the provisions of a charter, and the powers conveyed in the second instrument, or that of 1609, were large. But it was the London Company, not the colony, which held the charter. The company indeed treated the colony with a good degree of liberality, and in the concessions which it made laid a foundation for self-rule. These concessions, however, were granted simply as a matter of policy and good-will. With the cancelling of the charter in 1624 Virginia fell into the rank of a royal province, over which the governor was the appointee of the crown. This was its political status down to the American Revolution, with the exception of an interval in the commonwealth era.[1] But while in theory immediately dependent upon the crown, the Virginia colony nurtured a preference for self-rule, and was as well prepared as any of the American sisterhood for the era of independence.

[1] At a later date a long step was taken toward bringing Virginia under the proprietary régime. In 1673 Charles II. gave the whole territory to Arlington and Culpepper. The enormous grant, however, while it included great privileges, such as the entire church patronage of the colony, seems not to have involved a transfer of the government to the said lords. Culpepper, it is true, became governor a few years later, but by a special appointment from the king. The territorial right, too, as the case was managed, did not long continue in its full extent.

The charter of Massachusetts Bay was made out in 1629 to an English corporation under the name of the "Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England." In this instrument powers were conveyed for electing the officers needed in the government of the colony, and for making laws and ordinances not repugnant to those of England. The same year that the charter was granted a plan was devised to transfer it, or the whole administration under it, to the soil of New England. The offices were filled with those who engaged to reside in the new country. Thus from the start the colony of Massachusetts Bay was in a large sense a self-governed community. Rhode Island was equally favored. The charter which Roger Williams obtained in 1644, and under which the several settlements in that region were united two or three years later, was remarkably liberal. The colony was really exempted from the obligation to conform its laws to those of England, it being required only to secure such conformity as was agreeable to the nature and constitution of *the place and the people.* It was one of the anomalies of the reign of Charles II. that he renewed substantially the provisions of this charter (1663). From the same king Connecticut received a charter (1662) scarcely less generous in the measure of self-rule which it conferred. At the same time the territory of Connecticut was extended so as to include that of the New Haven colony. After some show of reluctance New Haven consented to the union. Plymouth never possessed a royal charter. It ranked nevertheless with its neighbors as regards the actual management of its affairs till its union with Massachusetts (1691). New

Hampshire and Maine, being disputed territory, had during their earlier history no very definite political status. The claims of Massachusetts over the former were settled adversely, and in 1679 New Hampshire was made a royal province. As for Maine, by purchase from the heirs of Gorges Massachusetts secured a title in that quarter (1677), that is, to the portion between the Piscataqua and Kennebec rivers. In general, it may be said that New England, during the whole middle portion of the seventeenth century was virtually a cluster of self-governed republics.

Among these free states, community of feeling and interest led Plymouth, Massachusetts Bay, Connecticut, and New Haven to enter into a species of confederation (1643). The arrangement had considerable significance for New England affairs till the consolidation of New Haven with Connecticut (1662–1665). In their internal administration these colonies were closely akin. The stamp of Puritanism was upon them all. Their people were generally hardy, frugal, and enterprising. Education was cared for as in no other colonies. As early as 1636–38, fifty years before a like enterprise was executed in any other English settlement, Harvard College was founded. Illiteracy among those born in the country was comparatively unknown. Social life bore traces of an austere spirit. The laws were stringent. Yet they constituted no such strait-jacket as those have been wont to imagine who have based their notions on the fabulous "blue laws" of New Haven. In no part of New England was there so near an approach to a genuine Draconian code as that under which Virginia was placed for an interval in her early

history. Compared with contemporary European codes those of Massachusetts and Connecticut were unquestionably humane.

The closing part of the Stuart era was a time of gloom and disaster for the New England colonies. Charles II. cancelled the charter of Massachusetts in 1684. James II. was minded to treat those of Rhode Island and Connecticut in like manner. New England was joined with New York under the supervision of a royal governor. The former system of self-rule was effectually swept away, and James was prepared to exemplify the theory that colonies are only appendages of the crown, when the Revolution of 1688 made him an exile from his kingdom. With the accession of William III. Rhode Island and Connecticut resumed their charters. Massachusetts, however, failed to recover the full measure of her liberties. Under the new charter which was granted her in 1691 the governor and deputy-governor were appointees of the crown. From this date to the Declaration of Independence there were no other colonies which ranked with Rhode Island and Connecticut in respect of political privileges.

The examples of proprietary governments were Maryland, Carolina, including both the northern and the southern province, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania along with Delaware. Georgia does not properly fall under this description, the trustees for founding that colony having rather the character of temporary managers than that of owners. Their right ended after twenty years, and Georgia then assumed the status of a royal colony. By a royal charter given in 1639 Ferdinando Gorges was made Lord Proprietor of the Province of

Maine, with full powers of government. But his transatlantic kingdom never became much more than a parchment affair.

In Maryland — the earliest example of the proprietary government — we have that type presented in all its length and breadth. By the terms of the charter Lord Baltimore was made the real sovereign of Maryland, the owner of the land, and the head of the legislative, judicial, and military systems within its limits; and what was secured to him personally was secured also to his heirs. In much the same terms Pennsylvania was conveyed to William Penn and his heirs. With intervals of interruption this form of government continued in these colonies till the war of Independence. In the two provinces of New Jersey it had a much shorter history. Proprietary rule ceased in them in 1702, after which they were united to form a royal province. In the Carolinas the rule of the proprietaries was practically overthrown in 1719, and ten years later their right was wholly cancelled. From the latter date North and South Carolina held each the status of a province under the crown. In general the proprietaries acted the part of liberal sub-monarchs and granted their subjects a fair share of political privileges. Those who held the Carolinas seem to have given the most ground of complaint; not so much that they wished to rule despotically as that they had an inordinate desire to illustrate political speculations. Having gotten up, with the aid of John Locke, an elaborate scheme of official dignities and class distinctions, they wished to make the colonists the mediums of displaying its merits. Thus, with a perseverance worthy of a better cause, they

pressed their "Fundamental Constitutions" upon a people to whom they were in no wise suited.

New York after its surrender to the English remained in the condition of a royal colony,[1] and for the greater part of the time enjoyed about the same political privileges as were conceded to Massachusetts under the charter of William III. During the period of Dutch control the most distinctive feature in its government was the full-blown feudal system which was introduced under the direction of the West India Company.

In the internal government of the colonies generally there were three main factors, the governor, the governor's council, and the assembly chosen by the people, the second being the prototype of the State senate.

Such was the political school in which were trained the communities that were to found the great republic of the western world. Separate units, with different antecedents and points of obvious dissimilarity, they felt the connecting bond of a common love for civil liberty. Hence the attempts of England to manacle their industries, to control their trade, and to impose taxes upon them without their consent, provoked a common resentment, which at length issued in a united declaration of independence.

When we speak of a common resentment and consequent uprising, the expression must be taken with a qualification. Recent writers justly notice the fact that the Revolutionary War was not altogether the war of one country against another. There were Tories in

[1] Technically speaking, there was an era of proprietary rule, but the proprietor, the Duke of York, was heir to the crown, and on his accession New York fell into the ordinary relation of a royal colony.

this country, and in some regions they formed no small percentage of the population. There were friends of the struggling colonists in England, leaders in Parliament who openly espoused their cause, and counted their victory in America a necessary safeguard for the cause of liberty in England. The war was a struggle of party with party, of the party holding liberal principles in both countries with the conservative upholders of arbitrary government in both.

The majority in America had sore need of the help of the minority in England. The achievement of independence was a desperate enterprise. It was not, however, one whit more desperate than the work of construction which was undertaken immediately afterward. Men who had no special motive to prophesy evil declared at the time that such diverse political units as were the colonies, scattered along such an extent of territory, could by no possibility be compacted into a stable government. That the task should have been successfully achieved shows that there were statesmen in the field quite above the rank of the ordinary manufacturers of paper constitutions. In truth, the nation which blesses the Divine Providence that gave a Washington and others to lead through the smoke and din of battle may well pour out equal thanksgiving for the Madison, the Hamilton, the Washington and others who, in the time of peace, wrought out the Federal Constitution and secured its adoption. No single group of statesmen in any country has ever reared a nobler monument of political wisdom.

That the unique structure, however, had one serious blemish was not hid even from those by whose hands it

was shaped. They reluctantly admitted the blemish because they considered it impossible otherwise to unite the colonies into a single nation. Thus resulted the compromise with slavery, — a postponing of trouble to fall in tenfold volume upon a later generation, which may have had, however, more than tenfold strength to bear the ordeal.

To one who knows how firm a hold slavery had upon the whole South before the middle of this century, a surprise can hardly fail to come, as he reads for the first time the numerous declarations and protests against it which were put on record at the close of the colonial period.

The traffic in human flesh had indeed been practised with little compunction in all the colonies. It was recognized in their several statute-books. Rhode Island, it is true, passed a law in 1652 limiting the enslavement of negroes, as well as of other bondmen, to a period of ten years. But it cannot be said that the law was steadily enforced. The northern colonies as well as the southern had their slaves, though in much smaller numbers in proportion to their population. For any colony to have excluded African bondmen would have been in direct contravention of the will of the mother country. It was a favorite item in the mercantile policy of England to keep an open slave market in her American dependencies. Even before the famous clause, — the so-called *asiento*, — in the treaty of Utrecht (1713) had given her a relative monopoly of the slave traffic, she would not tolerate a legislative restriction of it in any province under the crown. Of course after the enormous extension of the traffic had fostered a correspond-

ing greed, she was still less inclined to admit restriction. It was but a continuation of the policy which had been pursued in the preceding years when in 1770 the King sent an instruction to the Governor of Virginia, commanding him, "upon pain of the highest displeasure, to assent to no law by which the importation of slaves should be in any respect prohibited or obstructed."[1]

This governmental fostering of an inhuman traffic had begun, not far from the date of the above instruction, to provoke criticism on both sides of the Atlantic. Among the colonies there was a marked quickening of conscience on the subject, beginning near the middle of the century, — when the Quakers inaugurated their effective opposition to slavery, — and showing tokens of increasing vitality till the adoption of the Federal Constitution in 1789. In the northern colonies the small profit of the institution provided a favorable ground for the spread of the moral antipathy against it which some of the more generous and thoughtful minds entertained. In this quarter, therefore, the struggle for independence was the signal for the legal abolition of slavery. The same era of enlarged thought upon the essential rights of men called forth also many adverse comments on the system of human bondage from the southern communities. The leading statesmen of Virginia — Jefferson, Patrick Henry, George Mason, Richard Henry Lee, and Washington — all spoke against it, some of them in very positive terms. Jefferson denounced it in the first draft of the Declaration of Independence, and afterwards characterized it in terms which might well-nigh have satisfied the zeal of the typical abolitionist.

[1] Bancroft, History of the United States, iii 410.

The first assembly of colonial representatives, in 1774, passed a resolution against the further importation of slaves, and in 1787 the proposition to exclude slavery from the northwestern territories received the assent of all the southern States. In fact only two States, South Carolina and Georgia, seem to have been at that time thoroughly wedded to slavery.[1] But for the necessity of conciliating them, it is probable that no recognition of this form of human oppression would have been allowed to mar the constitution of the republic.[2]

II. — THE COLONIES IN THEIR RELATIONS TO THE NATIVES.

A large part of America, at the time of its discovery, was comparatively uninhabited. The West India islands

[1] For sixteen years negro slavery was excluded from Georgia. The motive for the regulation may have been considerations of prudence as well as humanitarian zeal. At any rate, shortly after the repeal of the restriction, the slave code of Georgia indicated very little tenderness for the bondman. A slave could be put to death for burning a stack of rice or barrel of pitch. Striking a white person entailed the same penalty in case of a third offence, or even for a first offence if the assault resulted in a grievous wound. Teaching slaves to write was strictly prohibited.

[2] Some of the principal works consulted in connection with the English colonies are the following: Bancroft, History of the United States; Narrative and critical History of America, edited by Justin Winsor; Palfrey, History of New England; C. W. Elliott, The New England History; S. G. Arnold, History of the State of Rhode Island; J. R. Brodhead, History of the State of New York; J. T. Scharf, History of Maryland; E. D. Neill, The Colonization of America, The Founders of Maryland, and Virginia Carolorum; F. L. Hawks, History of North Carolina; C. C. Jones, History of Georgia; John Fiske, The Beginnings of New England; also, the Critical Period of American History; J. A. Doyle, The English in America.

had in proportion to their extent a considerable population. Mexico, a part of Central America, and Peru were well-occupied regions, containing probably an aggregate of several millions of people. But north of Mexico any great mass of inhabitants was nowhere to be found. The broad prairie region was almost untenanted. We should be making no illiberal estimate if we should reckon the whole number of Indians north of the present Mexican border as not exceeding half a million at the time that the English and the French began their settlements.[1]

[1] Speaking of the region of the United States east of the Mississippi, George Bancroft says: "We shall approach, and perhaps rather exceed, a just estimate of their numbers at the spring-time of English colonization if to the various tribes of the Algonkin race we allow about ninety thousand; of the eastern Dakotas less than three thousand; of the Iroquois, including their southern kindred, about seventeen thousand; of the Catawbas, three thousand; of the Cherokees, twelve thousand; of the Mobilian confederacies and tribes, — that is, of the Chicasaws, Choctaws, and Creeks, including the Seminoles, — fifty thousand; of the Uchees, one thousand; of the Natchez four thousand; in all, it may be not far from one hundred and eighty thousand souls." (History of the United States, ii. 100.) L. H. Morgan adds the comment: "This is as large a number as our information will justify. There is not the slightest reason for supposing that they ever exceeded that number." (Indian Migrations, in Beach's Indian Miscellany.) "M. de la Joncaire, in 1736, drew up for the information of the home government an official estimate of the number of fighting men among all the savage tribes then in existence between Quebec and Louisiana (that is, nearly the whole of New France), and the total he ventured to give was but 16,000." (Garneau, History of Canada, i. 121.) Morgan, on the basis of reports from the Spanish explorers, concludes that the Pueblo (or village) Indians in New Mexico and its neighborhood numbered, near the middle of the sixteenth century, about fifty thousand. (Indian Migrations.) The Spanish missionaries, in 1802 estimated the California Indians at a little over thirty-two thousand. (Ibid.) In 1857 Sir George Simpson reckoned the Indian population of British America east of the Rocky Mountains at sixty-seven thousand, and those west of the mountains at eighty thousand. (Ibid.)

The more civilized of the aboriginal communities — the Incas in Peru, the Quichés in Guatemala, the Mayas in Yucatan, the Aztecs with their confederates in Mexico, and the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico — had evidently a territorial right that was worthy of some respect in the sight of the nations. They presented the aspect of settled communities, and some of them, the Peruvians in particular, used much diligence in developing the resources of their country. As for the other races or tribes, their occupation and improvement of the soil were evidently on too limited a scale to establish anything more than a partial title. While they might rightfully claim all that was needed for their sustenance, they had no just prerogative to keep waste so vast an inheritance by making it the exclusive domain of their savagery.

Whatever the right in any quarter, there was little power to enforce it against the grasping Europeans. The unity requisite for any formidable opposition was wanting. A bloody civil strife had greatly weakened Peru just before the coming of Pizarro, and the more legitimate claimant of the crown was a prisoner at the commencement of the conquest. The Aztec rule in Mexico was so feared or hated by various tribes that Cortés was able readily to unite a mass of native warriors with his little army of Spaniards, and thus to destroy the central power of the native empire. In the more northern regions the animosities of the tribes against each other caused that their strength should be expended in mutual slaughter rather than in checking the European invader. In only two instances was there any extended combination against the foreigners, — that of Philip in 1675, and that of Pontiac in 1763.

In the civil polity of the less advanced tribes, as in case of the old Germanic barbarians, there was a mixture of the hereditary and the elective principles, of democracy and chieftainship. The centrifugal tendency was conspicuous; but in some instances the process of separation into distinct tribes was offset by confederation. Among confederacies the Iroquois presented the example of the greatest power and success. While they might be reckoned among the fiercest of barbarians, they were in their way tolerably keen diplomats and statesmen.

The religion of the Indians was a polytheism tinged more or less with fetichism. They may have believed in a *superior*, but scarcely in a *supreme* Spirit. Even after their idea of the Great Spirit had been enlarged by contact with the Europeans, it was often sufficiently crude and anthropomorphic.[1] The religion of the more civilized Indians was not many degrees better than that of the rude tribes. The Aztecs and the Incas may have had a more elaborate ceremonial and priestly system, and may also have reached in a few points higher views of religious truth. But with both the more worthy ele-

[1] Parkman says: "The primitive Indian was as savage in his religion as in his life. He was divided between fetich-worship and that next degree of religious development which consists in the worship of deities embodied in the human form. His conception of their attributes was such as might have been expected. His gods were no whit better than himself. Even when he borrows from Christianity the idea of a Supreme and Universal Spirit, his tendency is to reduce Him to a local habitation and a bodily shape; and this tendency disappears only in tribes that have been long in contact with civilized white men. The primitive Indian, yielding his untutored homage to One All-pervading and Omnipotent Spirit, is a dream of poets, rhetoricians, and sentimentalists." (Jesuits in North America, Intro. lxxxix.)

ments were overlaid by a mass of superstitions, and in case of the Aztecs the offering of human sacrifices formed a more odious feature than any contained in the worship of the savage tribes. A like practice has been charged against the Incas, but it is claimed that the imputation grew out of a misunderstanding of the ancient Peruvian language, and is not sustained by the evidence.[1]

The Spaniards seem to have conceived that they brought with themselves a full right to whatever territories they might discover. They did not deem it necessary to solicit grants from the natives. On the contrary, they considered themselves licensed to seize the most valuable possessions of the natives, and made little or no scruple also about seizing their persons. Enormous cruelties stained the path of conquest. The gross estimates given by one and another Spanish witness, we need not believe. We think it a great exaggeration when Oviedo reports that two millions of the natives were sacrificed by the tyranny of Pedrarias, the governor at the Isthmus, or when Las Casas says that four or five millions were slaughtered in Guatemala within a period of sixteen years.[2] Such estimates border on the ridiculous. But that the lives of the natives were recklessly wasted, and in the most cruel ways, is not to be doubted. Oviedo reports of the adventurous De Soto that he much enjoyed the sport of killing Indians.[3] It is said that during the governorship of

[1] C R. Markham, in Narrative and Critical History of America, edited by Justin Winsor, vol. i.

[2] H. H. Bancroft, Central America, i 614; ii 235, 236.

[3] J. G. Shea, in Narrative and Critical History of America, vol. ii.

Pedrarias eighteen caciques were on one occasion given to bloodhounds, to be torn in pieces.[1] Ovando, the governor of Hayti, caused eighty caciques, who were suspected of disaffection, to be burned at the stake.[2] Cortés, in reprisal for the Pánuco rebellion, burned four hundred natives, if his own story may be believed.[3] Nuño de Guzman caused men to be hanged for simply neglecting to sweep the roads before him, and, maliciously identifying discontent with rebellion, enslaved whole towns which had been guilty of no real offence.[4] Mendoza, the first viceroy, though not in general a bad ruler, thought it proper to brand five thousand, who had ventured to assert their independence by force of arms, as slaves, besides inflicting cruel punishments and mutilations.[5]

Enslavement of the natives, actual or virtual, was part of the regular programme of the Spanish conquerors, and whatever restraint was put upon the practice was due to interference from without. Columbus thought it no sin to make slaves of the Indians, and was quite jubilant over the prospect of the revenue which might be obtained from cargoes of the human merchandise. The Spanish government, it is true, did not fully second this feature in the enterprise of the great explorer. Nevertheless, in conceding that Indians taken in war or guilty of specially odious crimes might be condemned to bondage, it left open a wide door to enslavement. Under the existing conditions an unfair

[1] Bancroft, Central America, i. 410.

[2] R. G. Watson, Spanish and Portuguese South America, i. 69.

[3] Bancroft, Mexico, ii. 122, vol. v. of Pacific States.

[4] Bancroft, Mexico, ii. 264, 267, 286.

[5] Ibid. ii. 532.

advantage was certain to be taken of the concession. For forty years, or until the publication of the so-called New Laws in 1543, this evil license was continued. And long after that date legal provision existed for placing the natives in wardship or a species of serfdom. Such was the *encomienda* system, which provided that the natives in a conquered district should be divided among the settlers, to be held by them for a term of years or for one or more lives, receiving from them instruction and protection, and obligated to render to them a certain service. This system was in vogue for two centuries. The result was that the great body of the natives had little of personal liberty. Forced labor and melancholy thinned their ranks, and with terrible rapidity in some quarters. The native population of the West India islands was soon reduced to a poor fraction of the former total. The yoke was also heavy upon the Peruvians; especially did the compulsory labor in the mines tell upon them with deadly effect. A part of the waste may have been the unavoidable result of contact with new conditions. To men who have not a good degree of robustness the impact of a new civilization is apt to bring a scathing influence. But a large part of the ruin must undoubtedly be charged to the greed and despotism of the conquerors.

This is the dark side of the subject. The brighter side is the courage and perseverance with which distinguished philanthropists, like Las Casas, sought to protect the natives and to work out humane laws in their behalf. The response which the Spanish government made to the appeals of these advocates is also a feature of relief. From the time that the New Laws were is-

sued — and to some extent before that date — it sought by repeated enactments to protect the natives. The temper of the colonists caused it to retract some of the more generous of its provisions; nevertheless it continued to exhibit conspicuous zeal and watchfulness in behalf of the aboriginal peoples. Its record on the whole is very creditable; at least it would be necessary to account it so, if it had not given such an example of merciless rigor in the home administration, and had not promoted the enslavement of Africans while seeking to restrict that of Indians.[1]

Hand in hand with conquest went the work of converting the natives. The stern invaders themselves had a species of religious zeal, and for every two glances which they directed to the golden calf were ready to bestow one upon the Virgin Mary. The friars who followed plentifully in their wake, as they took in general a kindly interest in the welfare of the natives, labored zealously to induct them into the Christian religion. Among the settled populations the displacement of the old idolatry progressed rapidly. To practice it openly under the eyes of their masters was out of the question, and various motives conspired to make them willing to accept, at least nominally, the substitute which was offered. What Bancroft says of the Mexicans, in this relation, will apply in part to the other semi-civilized communities. There were several reasons, he remarks,

[1] The Portuguese had instituted African slavery near the middle of the fifteenth century. America, however, first offered them a considerable market. About a decade from the first voyage of Columbus, negroes began to be imported into Hayti. The rapid decline of the native population gave a strong incentive to the traffic.

for the broad, though superficial, success in proselyting. "Foremost stood fear and policy, for it was dangerous to disobey the conquerors, while favors could be gained by courting them. Then came the undefined belief with many that the religion of men so superior in prowess and intelligence must contain some virtue, something superior to their own. . . . Further, the new rites and doctrines had many similarities to their own to commend them to the natives. Baptism was used for infants generally, and purifying water was applied also by ascetics; the communion was taken in different forms, as wafer or bread, and as pieces from the consecrated dough statue of the chief god, the latter form being termed *teoqualo*, 'God is eaten;' confession was heard by regular confessors, who extended absolution in the name of the deity concerned. The idea of a trinity was not unknown, and according to Las Casas' investigations, even a virgin-born member of it; the flood existed in recorded traditions, and Cholula pyramid embodied a Babel myth, while the mysterious Quetzalcoatl lived in the hopes, especially of the oppressed, as the expected Messiah. Lastly the cross, so wide-spread as a symbol, held a high religious significance also here, bearing among other names that of the 'tree of life.' Although these similarities appeared to the friars partly as a profanation, and were pointed out as a perversion by the Evil One, nevertheless they failed not to permit a certain association or mingling of pagan and Christian ideas in this connection, with a view to promote the acceptance of the latter. The Indians on their side availed themselves so freely of this privilege as frequently to rouse the observation that they had merely

changed the names of their idols and rites."[1] Not a few, it would appear, made even a less change than this in accepting Christianity. With a good degree of pertinacity they continued to practise some of the old rites in spite of their new professions. "Many placed the images behind the crosses and saint tablets, or worshipped them with elaborate ceremonies, in common with others, in secret localities. When remonstrated with for his obstinacy, a cacique once exclaimed: 'How is it,' pointing to the picture of a saint, 'that you Spaniards preach so much against idolatry while you yourselves worship images?' The Spaniard replied with the usual explanation, 'that they did not adore the images, but gazed on them in meditation of the great virtues of the saints whom they represent.' Hereupon the chieftain remarked: 'Neither do we worship images of gold or wood; our prayers and sacrifices are offered to God.'"[2]

The uncertain tenure of Christianity in the minds of its native professors was signally illustrated in New Mexico. In all the pueblos of that region it had been enthroned within a generation from the conquest. In 1630, if Spanish accounts may be trusted, the Christianized natives amounted to sixty thousand. Yet, fifty years later, when the signal for rebellion was sounded, Christianity was almost universally repudiated.[3] In Zuñi alone was any respect paid to its memorials or its rites during the twelve years of independence which followed the uprising of 1680. The reinstatement of

[1] Mexico, ii. 181, 182.

[2] Bancroft, Mexico, ii 179.

[3] Bancroft, New Mexico and Arizona, vol. xii., in Pacific States.

Spanish authority was at the same time a restoration of the Roman Catholic religion; but the mission had seen by far its best days. By 1760 the pueblo natives had been reduced to a total of less than ten thousand.

Among the uncivilized tribes the results of missionary effort were not specially encouraging. In this field the Spaniards as well as the French expended not a little of self-sacrificing devotion. At times the work seemed prosperous; but it never gained a solidity which enabled it to withstand adversity. In Florida the harvest was not large in comparison with the martyr blood that was shed in founding the mission. It was only a very moderate success also that was achieved in Texas. In California, on the other hand, the Franciscans were able to boast of considerable progress (1769–1840). Here the plan was pursued of gathering the baptized natives into communities, where their industrial as well as religious training was in the hands of the missionaries. The last of these communities was formed in 1823, when the list was made up to twenty-one. An approach to this species of establishments had been exemplified by the Jesuits in Lower California until the work there was taken from their control (1767). It was, however, the "reductions" in Paraguay (1610–1767) which afforded the most conspicuous example, under Jesuit auspices, of the policy of isolating the converted Indians from outside influences and subjecting them to a minute and searching tuition.[1] This policy had its obvious advantages. The ultimate result, nevertheless, was not highly satisfactory. It was found that the Indians had gained no independent basis of religious or

[1] See the account given in the preceding volume, pp. 407, 408.

civilized manhood. Both in the Californian and the Paraguayan instance, as soon as the fostering and the guiding hand of the missionary was withdrawn, there remained but a scant memorial of the labor expended. The terrible death-rate among the gathered natives, at least in the California establishments, was also a drawback. In mentioning these qualifying features we have no design to prefer any radical impeachment against either the skill or the humanity of the missionaries. The fact is, the uncivilized red man was a fearfully hard subject to manage. Leave him with his tribe, and it was exceedingly difficult to get into him any genuine religion or civilization. Change his outward condition and place him under the restraints of an orderly life, in the midst of Christian surroundings, and on the one hand his health was subjected to a severe trial, while on the other the root of his savagery still remained in his breast, ready to spring up as soon as opportunity might come, into the old tempers and habits.[1]

The settlement of the Portuguese in Brazil had its favorable aspect for the natives. They came, not as gold-hunters, or plunderers and extortioners, but with the purpose of improving the country agriculturally.

[1] This fact is graphically set forth in the following from a Roman Catholic writer: "After months, nay years, of teaching, the missionaries found that the fickle savage was easily led astray; never could they form pupils to our life and manners. The nineteenth century failed, as the seventeenth failed, in raising up priests from the Iroquois or the Algonquin; and at this day [1855] a pupil of the Propaganda, who disputed in Latin on theses of Peter Lombard, roams at the head of a half-naked band in the billowy plains of Nebraska." (J. G. Shea, History of Catholic Missions among the Indian Tribes of the United States, p. 26.)

Their appearance, however, had its doleful prophecy for the poor aborigines. For the Portuguese were the most eager, practised, and expert slave-catchers of the time. It is hardly necessary to state that it did not take long for their evil aptitude to display itself to the serious cost of the Indians.

Happily there were those in the Portuguese settlements who rivalled the industrious philanthropy which Las Casas had displayed for the Indians under Spanish rule. The Jesuits were represented in Brazil by men of conspicuous talents and devotion, as is sufficiently evidenced by the names of Nobrega, Anchieta, and Vieyra. In them and their associate missionaries the natives found powerful advocates. Vieyra in particular was untiring in his efforts to secure protective measures from the government. Bounds were thus set to the enslavement of the Indians, especially as the importation of negroes supplied a substitute for their labor. The decree for their complete emancipation came simultaneously with that for the expulsion of the Jesuits (1759–60).

A prominent item of the missionary method adopted in Brazil was the placing of the natives in villages by themselves under the supervision of their religious instructors. These villages, however, were not given over so completely to the control of the missionaries as were the reductions in Paraguay. While the Portuguese settlers were not expected to dwell in them, they were privileged to make requisition upon their superintendents for a quota of laborers, to serve for a portion of the year. The Brazilian Indians accordingly did not come to feel such an absolute dependence upon their religious directors as did those in Paraguay.

The relation of the French to the Indians was different from that which the Spaniards or the English assumed with them. They neither adopted toward them the mien of conquerors nor asked from them grants of territory. Their ostensible relation was in part that of allies, and in part that of patrons. Few in numbers and receiving but small resources from the French government, they made up by diplomacy for their lack of strength. They dwelt with the natives on friendly terms, were careful to avoid affronting their feeling of independence, and were content to bring them gradually into the status of subjects of France. No other nationality can be said to have shown equal tact in dealing with the uncivilized red men, or equal capacity for entering into sympathetic relationship with them.

The French missions covered a wide range. They included the Abenakis in Maine, the Hurons in Upper Canada and Michigan, the Iroquois in New York, the Ottawas in Michigan and Wisconsin, the Illinois in the region which still bears their name, and various tribes in the lower valley of the Mississippi. The Iroquois mission was only temporary (1667–1687). A number of the converts, however, were transferred to Canadian soil, and formed there the basis of an Iroquois community. A colony from the Christianized Abenakis was also transferred to the northern region.

The method pursued in this mission field is thus described, in contrast with that which prevailed in some of the Spanish territories: "The French missionary planted his cross among the heathen, and won all that he could to the faith, and whenever he could, formed a distinct village of Christians; but these villages were never like

the missions of the Spanish missionaries. The French priest left his neophyte free, — setting him no task, building no splendid edifices by his toil. The Spanish mission contained its workshops, dormitories, infirmaries, and granaries; the French mission was a fort against hostile attack, and inclosed merely the church, mission-house, and mechanics' sheds, — the Indians all living without in cabins or houses, and entering the fort only in time of danger."[1]

The Récollets, or Franciscans of the Strict Observance, were the first missionaries in the region of Quebec. After ten years, or in 1625, they were joined by the Jesuits.[2] The temporary occupation of Quebec, by the English, which occurred a few years later, gave a brief interruption to the mission. In the resumption of the enterprise (1633) the Jesuits took the lead, and the following decades were the heroic period of the Order in New France. A preceding page has given us occasion to mention the name of Brébeuf and others, who exhibited in a notable degree the devotion and fortitude of martyrs.[3]

That the French Jesuits were their own historians has no doubt affected the estimate of their work. An impartial outsider would have given to the narrative of their labors a somewhat different coloring from that which it bears in their "relations."[4] The authentic

[1] Shea, Catholic Missions, p. 128.

[2] Representatives of the Order of Jesuits had come to Port Royal in Acadia in 1611. Two years later they attempted a settlement at Mt. Desert, on the coast of Maine, but the unkind visit of Argall from Virginia spoiled their project in this region.

[3] See the first volume of The Modern Church, pp. 408, 409.

[4] This is the view of one of the most recent of Canadian historians. Speaking of the papal decree closing the publication of missionary

record, while it has its bright pages, has others that are quite destitute of lustre. It may justly be charged that the Jesuits were over-anxious for their own importance. They sought to control the administration at Quebec. They wished to duplicate among the western tribes the theocratic régime of Paraguay, and showed a pronounced jealousy toward La Salle, while he was undertaking the exploration of the Mississippi, because his project did not appear to be directed to their aggrandizement. Count Frontenac may have acted the part of a prejudiced witness when he wrote: "The Jesuits will not civilize the Indians because they wish to keep them in perpetual wardship. They think more of beaver skins than of souls, and their missions are pure mockeries." [1] This is undoubtedly too strong. But it is certain that the religion of many of their neophytes was a thin veneer of so-called Catholicity spread over a savagery that had undergone no appreciable abatement. How far the missionaries were responsible for the unchristian ferocity

letters (1673), as being probably directed especially against those of the Jesuits, he adds: "Ce qui est certain, c'est que, au Canada, les habitants étaient, depuis des années, mécontents de ces récits dans lesquels les faits étaient presque toujours dénaturés. . . . L'exclusivisme qui règne dans ces narrations et que l'on a voulu excuser en disant qu'elles sont consacrées uniquement aux affaires religieuses, n'est que trop réel et par suite condamnable. Les jésuites savaient bien ce qu'ils faisaient en représentant les choses sous un jour favorable à leurs seuls interêts. . . On a raison de se moquer, comme l'a fait le père Le Clercq, de ce nombre prodigieux de sauvages convertis qui ont disparu du moment où les Relations cessèrent de circuler en France. . . . Sous le couvert de la religion, l'intrigue a été longtemps victorieuse en Canada, et encore de nos jours, la presse bonasse accepte la prétendue tradition des 'jésuites bienfaiteurs de ce pays,' sans rien connaître et sans rien peser." (Benj. Sulte, Histoire des Canadiens-Français, iv., 107, 108.)

[1] Parkman, Count Frontenac and New France, p. 25.

still remaining is not easy to determine. The Indians, it must be allowed, were not altogether passive subjects in their hands.

The much greater number of the English colonists made them of necessity, in their relations to the aborigines, a more encroaching power than the French. It is probably true also that the former, as a body, were stiffer and less affable than the latter in dealing with the children of the forest. Their natural sentiments interposed a wider social barrier against the Indians than was raised by the temper of the French. Notwithstanding the example of John Rolfe, they showed less inclination to intermarry with the natives. In this incompatibility there was evidently a poor omen for the Indians. Unable to mix with the English, it only remained for them to retreat before the sturdy aggressive race, unless extraordinary wisdom and charity should be at hand to adjust and supervise their mutual relations.

Still, the evidence shows that the English colonies started on the basis of a friendly treatment of the natives. Whatever injuries may have been done here and there by representatives of the "mixed multitude," the tenor of the early colonial legislation was in the line of fair dealing. The ruthlessness with which the Spaniards fell upon the occupants of the soil was nowhere exhibited. In a large proportion of instances the settlers entered into a specific agreement with the natives and paid a stipulated price for their lands. Speaking of the Plymouth colony, Josiah Winslow was able, in 1676, to make this declaration: "I think I can

clearly say that before these present troubles broke out, the English did not possess one foot of land in this colony but what was fairly obtained by honest purchase of the Indian proprietors. Nay, because some of our people are of a covetous disposition, and the Indians are in their straits easily prevailed with to part with their lands, we first made a law that none should purchase or receive of gift any land of the Indians without the knowledge and allowance of our Court. . . . And if at any time they brought complaints before us, they have had justice impartial and speedy, so that our own people have frequently complained that we erred on the other hand in showing them overmuch favor." John Fiske is of opinion that the same might be said of the neighboring colonies. "The general laws of Massachusetts and Connecticut," he adds, "as well as of Plymouth, bear out what Winslow says, and show us that as a matter of policy the colonial governments were fully sensible of the importance of avoiding all occasions for quarrel with their savage neighbors."[1] In New Jersey and Pennsylvania likewise there was a purchase of lands from the natives. In Georgia they were consulted respecting territorial occupation, and were treated by Oglethorpe with exemplary kindness. Virginia and Maryland also showed a good degree of discretion and equity in their dealings with the Indians.

A darker phase, it must be conceded, entered finally into the general picture. Indian atrocities were responded to with fierce energy, and reprisals did not always stop short with the guilty. In New England the terrible ravages consequent upon the war of exter-

[1] Beginnings of New England, pp. 199, 200.

mination which was undertaken by Philip and his allies, quenched sympathy for the Indians, engendered toward them a deep distrust, and kindled in too many hearts an unpitying hate. It is scarcely surprising that the colonists, thinking of ruined homes and friends ruthlessly butchered, should have been incited to sell some hundreds of the captive Indians into slavery. The act, nevertheless, was far from being humane or Christian. So, even at that time, judged a few of the more just and clear-sighted New Englanders. In South Carolina the settlers enslaved the natives without waiting for any such weighty provocation. One fourth of all the slaves of the province were reported in 1708 as being Indians.

That the missionary enterprise of the English was on a much smaller scale than that of the Spaniards or the French is a fact that can be readily explained. Such enterprise, to be largely prosecuted, needs both special institutions and special habitudes. Protestantism in the first century of its history was sufficiently occupied with the herculean task of maintaining its own existence in Europe. At the time, therefore, that the English colonies were planted, it had not been habituated to the work of evangelizing the uncivilized races, and had little or no equipment for such work. The requisite agents were not within reach. The more southern colonies found it difficult to secure anything like an adequate supply of pastors even for the white population, and those in the North had no excess. In the great orders of the Romish Church, on the other hand, — the Franciscans, the Dominicans, and the Jesuits, — there was almost a superfluity of laborers to be utilized in

any field that might be opened. Protestantism was to demonstrate its missionary capacity; but the conditions ordained that the demonstration should not come in the seventeenth century, though possibly it might have come earlier than the nineteenth century had there been no culpable torpor. Romish apologists, who have endeavored to make capital out of the contrasts of the colonial epoch, might have saved some of their rhetoric had they viewed the situation with more candor and insight.

In New England, which enjoyed in the seventeenth century a larger religious equipment than the other English settlements, it is to be noticed that a very good beginning was made toward the evangelization of the natives. It is estimated that in 1674 the number of "Praying Indians" amounted to four thousand.

Continuous effort to instruct the Indians in the Christian faith was begun by Thomas Mayhew, upon the islands of Nantucket and Martha's Vineyard about 1643. After his death (1657), his father, of the same name, took up the work and passed it on to a line of successors in the Mayhew family. Near the same time that the evangelization of the natives on the islands was undertaken, a fruitful work was begun within the bounds of the Plymouth colony by the benevolent and enterprising laymen, Richard Bourne and Thomas Tupper. In Massachusetts the most distinguished laborer was John Eliot, and it is not without a certain justice that he has been called the Apostle of the Indians, though several were only second to him in their achievements. From the time that he began to preach to the natives at Nonantum, in 1646, to the time of his death, he was their unfailing friend, counsellor, advocate, and

teacher. His enormous labor in translating the whole Bible, together with some other writings, into the Indian tongue, calls for scarcely more admiration than the rare combination of patience, firmness, and tact with which he directed and trained his eccentric pupils. As his work progressed he became convinced that the Christian natives should be placed in communities by themselves. Several villages of Praying Indians were accordingly founded, the first being that of Natick (1651). In the management of these he endeavored to introduce, as far as was feasible, the element of self-help and self-dependence. The Indians themselves were intrusted with the town administration; and, moreover, such of them as had the necessary gifts were encouraged to use them in religious instruction. Some fifteen hundred were under this régime on the eve of Philip's war. Unhappily that war proved to be a serious ordeal for these communities. After the besom of destruction had gone by they were found, where not extinct, to be much reduced, and the full measure of former prosperity never returned.

The work of Eliot and his contemporaries awakened no little interest in England. In 1649 a practical response was given by the passage of an ordinance instituting the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel among the Indians, and providing for the collection of funds. This society was re-established early in the reign of Charles II., under the presidency of the distinguished Robert Boyle, and rendered a valuable assistance to Eliot in supplying a financial basis to his enterprise.

In the eighteenth century an effort affording not a

little encouragement was made among the Mohegan Indians at Stockbridge, on the western border of Massachusetts. The labors of John Sergeant were specially fruitful in this field (1734–1749). His mantle fell upon his son of the same name, who continued the work, after an interval during which the mission was in the charge successively of Jonathan Edwards and Stephen West. Contemporary with the progress of the Stockbridge mission were the labors of the Connecticut minister, Eleazar Wheelock, who exhibited much earnestness and ability in educating Indian youth. In the same period also New England sent several laborers westward among the Iroquois.

If other sections in general did less than New England for the religious instruction of the Indians, there was at least an exhibition of good intentions. The first Virginia Assembly legislated as follows: "Be it enacted, that for laying a surer foundation of the conversion of the Indians to the Christian religion, each town, city, borough, and particular plantation, do obtain unto themselves by just means a certain number of the natives' children to be educated by them in true religion and a civil course of life; of which children the most towardly boys in wit and graces of nature to be brought up by them in the first elements of literature, so as to be fitted for the college intended for them, that from thence they may be sent to that work of conversion." This action was in accordance with the instructions of King James and the Virginia Company. Only a few steps, however, were taken toward carrying out the plan. The great Indian massacre of 1622 fatally interfered with the generous enterprise, which without this drawback would

probably have needed, in order to be made eminently successful, better appliances than were then available.

Good designs were also entertained in connection with other colonies. Something in the way of actual achievement was accomplished by the Dutch pastors at Albany and Schenectady among the neighboring Mohawks, and by various representatives of the Episcopalian and Presbyterian clergy in New York among the Iroquois during the course of the eighteenth century. The success of David Brainerd (1742–1747) in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania indicated that the cause of Indian evangelization had found in him a specially competent workman; but his early death gave but a brief opportunity to his talents and devotion. The missionary enterprise, which became a passion with the Moravians almost from the time of their organization under Zinzendorf, was generously expended in efforts to convert the Indians during the last sixty years of the eighteenth century. A promising beginning was made by them in New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio. Rude interruptions despoiled them in large part of the proper fruit of their toil. So much the more should historic justice pay tribute to their devotion. Especially does the work of David Zeisberger, the Apostle of the Delawares, including as it did three score years of unremitting efforts for the salvation of the red men, call for a grateful and reverent acknowledgment.

III. — ROMAN CATHOLIC ESTABLISHMENTS.

Aside from attempts to convert the natives, Roman Catholicism in the colonial epoch of America presents but few noteworthy developments. The present topic, therefore, invites us to add only a brief catalogue of facts to what has been given in the preceding section.

A special feature of the establishment in Spanish America was its dependence upon the crown. Unaware of the broad range to which the privileges granted would apply, Alexander VI. and Julius II. conferred upon the Spanish monarch the tithes of the newly discovered regions, together with the exclusive right of nominating episcopal dignitaries and bestowing benefices. Indeed the ecclesiastical centre was placed at Madrid rather than at Rome. Papal bulls and briefs were required to be submitted to the Council of the Indies before they could be published. Directions were not unfrequently issued to the colonial authorities, enjoining them to return to the Council of the Indies such documents as had not been reviewed and approved by that body.[1]

The different ranks of the hierarchy were soon represented in the Spanish settlements. Panama was made an episcopal seat in 1521. Mexico received her first bishop in 1527 in the person of Julian Garcés. Near the same time Zumárraga was appointed as the second in the list. In 1547 Mexico became an archdiocese,

[1] Watson, Spanish and Portuguese America, ii. 136, 137; H. H. Bancroft, Mexico, iii. 685, 686. Chevalier, Mexico, Ancient and Modern, i. 369, 370.

with jurisdiction over nine suffragan bishops. Zumárraga was invited to be the first incumbent, but declined on account of his years. In the view of his contemporaries he was a man of merit and distinction. Later generations, however, regard his name with little complacency on account of one great folly, his pious vandalism in destroying the Aztec libraries.[1] In South America, Lima became directly after the conquest an important ecclesiastical seat. Among the early prelates of this region a special celebrity belongs to Toribio de Mogrovejo, Archbishop of Lima (1581–1606). Journeying assiduously over the broad district under his charge, through the valleys of the coast and the heights of the Andes, instructing and catechising as he had opportunity, he paid to his flock the full debt of kindly interest and self-sacrificing toil. He was canonized in 1680. In this honor he had been preceded by a disciple, a young woman, whose great beauty was only rivalled by her religious consecration, the Santa Rosa, whom the people of Lima revere as their patron saint.

Among the inferior clergy three classes were distinguished: the *curas*, or parish priests; the *doctrineros*, or the religious teachers of the native neophytes in the conquered districts; and the *misioneros*, or the laborers in the outlying regions where Spanish authority was not yet well established. In the earlier part of the period

[1] Says Bancroft: "All else we could readily forgive the bishop, even the occasional burning of a few old witches; but the destruction of the Aztec libraries, the mountains of native historical documents, and monumental works at Tlatelulco, must ever be regarded as an unpardonable offence. We cannot deplore deeply enough this irreparable loss, the hieroglyphic history of nations unknown, reaching back a thousand years or more." (Mexico, ii. 558.)

the regular or monastic clergy occupied the field, and they remained to the end a very conspicuous factor. The evidence indicates that the first generations of regulars were, in the main, earnest and self-denying laborers. Nor can it be doubted that men of this cast were found among the later representatives. But a century wrought a very perceptible declension. At length the authorities became convinced that the services of the regulars bore an ill proportion to their special privileges. Not far from the middle of the eighteenth century a decisive decree was issued, excluding them henceforth from vacant benefices and ordaining that the parishes should be manned with the secular clergy. That the latter had earned this preference by their superior virtue and enterprise cannot be maintained. As is indicated by a list of official documents, their ranks, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, included many adventurers of meagre talents and slender virtue, who sought in the colonies a success which they could not hope to obtain at home. The new regulations, however, as enlarging the sphere which was open to the seculars, tended to introduce a better element.

In the early part of the nineteenth century the secular clergy in the Mexican viceroyalty numbered about five thousand. The church property at the same date, including both secular and regular, is supposed to have been equal to half the value of the real estate of the country.

For an interval the Spanish dependencies managed questions of heresy without the aid of a regular tribunal of inquisition. But Philip II. took care that so essential a part of an ecclesiastical outfit should not be wanting.

In 1570 and 1571 he provided for tribunals of the Holy Office at Mexico, Lima, and Carthagena. The Indians, as being insufficiently instructed, were for the most part exempted from its jurisdiction. This was no great refinement of mercy, since the plainest common-sense must have dictated that the Inquisition would have too much work on hand if it should undertake to deal strictly with the great mass of natives, as yet but partially weaned from their paganism. The limitation, however, did not rob the tribunal of employment. At an auto-de-fé, celebrated at Mexico in 1574, sixty-three victims were exhibited, of whom five were burned. Other spectacles of the kind followed, so that by the year 1596 ten autos had been performed. Within thirty years more than two thousand subjects for inquisitorial scrutiny had been discovered. How much was accomplished between 1600 and the end of the eighteenth century is not very precisely determined. It is known, however, that not a few autos were held. At the latter date the introduction of books impregnated with free-thinking gave the inquisitors a special occasion for activity.[1]

In Lima the first auto was celebrated in 1581, the last in 1776, the whole number being twenty-nine. Of the victims at these spectacles fifty-nine were burned alive.[2] The bloodiest outburst of inquisitorial cruelty was that which fell upon Portuguese Jews between 1630 and 1640.[3] Among those who were disciplined in the

[1] Llorente, Histoire de l'Inquisition, ii. 198–200; H. H. Bancroft, Mexico, ii. 677–681; iii. 699–701.

[2] C. R. Markham, Peru, p. 149.

[3] Medina, Historia del Tribunal del Santo Oficio de la Inquisicion de Lima.

early part of the eighteenth century was a band of mystics, followers of the Jesuit Juan Francisco de Ulloa. Their views, which were circulated at Santiago, were much like those of the distinguished quietist Molinos.[1]

Brazil, unlike the Spanish dependencies, was not favored with a special tribunal of inquisition.

The auto de fé might have served to remind the natives in Mexico that the country had been provided with a tolerably adequate substitute for the old Aztec war-god and the stone of sacrifice. A compensation for more amiable features of their ancient religion was early furnished by the miraculous appearance and memorial of the Virgin of Guadalupe (1531). As the pleasing story runs, an Indian convert by the name of Juan Diego was surprised in the way by a vision of the Virgin Mary. Following her command, he gathers from the roses in the neighborhood and brings them in his mantle to the Mother of Mercy. Having taken them in her hands she replaces them in the mantle and instructs him to present them to the bishop. The errand is fulfilled, when lo, upon the unfolded mantle, the image of the Virgin is found to have been distinctly painted. The honored cloth obtains a fitting shrine, and annually attracts the gaze of thousands of visitors. To the natives the miraculous token must have been especially agreeable, as indicating that the Virgin was ready to be the patroness of the conquered as well as of the Spaniards.

A strained relation between the secular and the ecclesiastical power was not an infrequent episode in the Spanish provinces. Canada experienced a like

[1] Medina, Hist. de la Inquisicion en Chile.

occasion of disturbance, owing largely to the character of her first bishop. Laval, who was sent out as vicar apostolic in 1659, and in 1674 was made bishop of Quebec, was a man of aggressive and domineering temper. His view of the proper relation of Church and State, if a recent eulogist may be taken as authority,[1] was of a decidedly ultramontane cast. Since the Jesuits served him as efficient allies, he was able in a measure to illustrate his theory. Among political achievements, he is credited with making one governor and unmaking two.

A better memorial of the bishop's activity was provided in the educational institutions which he established, — his seminaries for priests and boys respectively, to which recently Laval University has been added, the whole constituting one of the most important of Roman Catholic foundations in North America.

The advent of Laval marked the close of the purely missionary régime in Canada. One feature of that régime, however, was perpetuated. Laval was not willing that the curé, or parish priest, should be so much of a fixture as he was ordinarily in France. He wished rather to exercise his own pleasure in stationing and removing curés, just as was done with the mis-

[1] As reported in the "Montreal Weekly Herald," Nov. 2, 1872, the Jesuit Braun thus epitomized the views of Laval: "The supremacy and infallibility of the Pope; the independence and liberty of the Church; the subordination and submission of the State to the Church; in case of conflict between them, the Church to decide, the State to submit; for whoever follows and defends these principles, life and a blessing; for whoever rejects and combats them, death and a curse." (Quoted by Parkman, Old Régime, p. 166.)

sionaries by their superiors. His plan was challenged, but his pertinacity seems to have won the victory. "At this day the system of removable curés prevails in most of the Canadian parishes."[1]

Louisiana was regarded as ecclesiastically dependent upon Quebec, the bishop of the latter having jurisdiction over the former. Some years after the transfer of Louisiana to Spain the bishop of Cuba took the place of the Canadian prelate.

As has been noticed on a previous page, the British occupation of Canada was soon followed by large concessions to the religion of the French inhabitants. Whatever other motive may have dictated the concessions, it was obviously a matter of political discretion to conciliate a people who formed an immense majority of a distant province, and the value of whose friendship began to be emphasized by increasing omens of a war of independence in the territory to the south.

IV. — ROMAN CATHOLICS IN THE ENGLISH COLONIES.

The English colonies afforded, on the whole, but little encouragement to Roman Catholic immigration. The barrier which they raised was only less effective against Romanists than that which was set up against Protestants in the Spanish and French domains. Most of the colonies which provided otherwise for a general tolerance had in their charters or laws an excepting clause against the members of the Papal Church. Pennsylvania allowed a fair measure of tolerance in practice, though the pressure of the English

[1] Parkman, Old Régime, p. 161.

government seems to have secured on her statute-book a discrimination against Roman Catholics. Rhode Island for a considerable interval had no law against the practice of the Roman Catholic religion, and the disabling clause which was included in her statutes at a later date, to meet probably some special exigency in English politics, is not known to have had any practical effect.[1] On the side of proscription, the acme of severity was realized by enactments of Massachusetts and New York in 1647 and 1700 respectively. In the one case it was ordered that any "Jesuit, or spiritual or ecclesiastical person ordained by the authority of the Pope of the See of Rome," should be required to leave the colony, and on his return, except by reason of shipwreck or in the character of an ambassador, should be hanged. In the other case it was decreed that Romish priests voluntarily entering the colony should be liable to hanging.[2] In neither instance, so far as we

[1] Arnold contends that the disabling clause was not adopted by any formal vote, but was interpolated by the committee employed in collecting the statutes, probably in the year 1699. He concedes, however, that in the subsequent action of the Rhode Island Legislature it received a species of recognition. (History of the State of Rhode Island, ii. 490–497.)

[2] This law, it is said, was due rather to the urgency of the English Governor, Bellomont, than to the temper of the legislature. It is to be remembered, too, that New York at that time apprehended danger from her Roman Catholic neighbors in Canada. If the danger was not real, it was owing to the lack of adequate power in the field rather than to the purposes of the French government. No farther back than 1689, as Count Frontenac was about to resume the direction of affairs in Canada, Louis XIV. had set forth such particulars as the following, respecting the treatment of the colonists whom he was expecting to conquer: "If any Catholics were found in New York, they might be left undisturbed, provided that they take an oath of allegiance to the

are aware, did the intolerant legislation give rise to any martyrdom.[1]

In the preceding paragraph no account has been taken of Maryland, since its peculiar relation to Roman Catholic immigration requires a special consideration. The more important points concern three assumptions which until recently have been commonly entertained: (1) that a foremost interest with Lord Baltimore was to provide in Maryland a refuge for Roman Catholics; (2) that the colony of Maryland was in its first stages predominantly Roman Catholic; (3) that special honor is due to a Roman Catholic legislature for having passed the act of tolerance in 1649.

In considering the first assumption it is not necessary to examine into the spirit and designs of George Calvert, or the first Lord Baltimore, since it was under his son Cecilius that the project of colonization was

King. Officers and other persons who had the means of paying ransoms were to be thrown into prison. All lands in the colony, except those of Catholics swearing allegiance, were to be taken from their owners, and granted under a feudal tenure to French officers and soldiers. . . . Mechanics and other workmen might, at the discretion of the commanding officer, be kept as prisoners to work at fortifications and do other labor. The rest of the English and Dutch inhabitants, men, women, and children, were to be carried out of the colony and dispersed in New England, Pennsylvania, or other places, in such manner that they could not combine in any attempt to recover their property and their country. And, that the conquest might be perfectly secure, the nearest settlements of New England were to be destroyed, and those more remote laid under contribution." (Parkman, Count Frontenac and New France, p. 189.)

[1] It is recorded that in the panic resulting from a supposed negro plot in New York (1741), one who may have been a priest was hanged. But his execution, though in all probability a gross injustice, was based on alleged complicity with a scheme of murder and rapine.

carried out. This being understood, the assumption cannot be admitted without large abatement. Had it been a leading object with Lord Baltimore to provide an asylum for Roman Catholics he would naturally have taken pains to fill up his colony with the adherents of his own faith. But it cannot be shown that he did this. Supposing that at the start he was not able to control the matter, it was certainly a voluntary act of his, when nine or ten years later he invited the Puritans of Massachusetts to settle in Maryland. Why extend such an invitation? Did he think that the Puritans were so kindly in their feelings toward Romanism that their presence in large numbers would give security in Maryland to those professing the Romish religion? No, Cecilius Calvert, Lord Baltimore, was a man of sober business instincts. The maintenance of his proprietary right and the development of his principality, so as to make it financially profitable, were his foremost objects. He was not in any emphatic sense a philanthropist; the invited Puritans were not in special need of his commiseration. Still less was he a religious zealot. Doubtless he wished to favor his co-religionists; but he would not do it at too great expense. He put a check upon the Jesuit missionaries, and informed them that they could not expect special rights and exemptions when he found that their course was prejudicing his relation with the home government. In the time of the Commonwealth he pushed his policy of worldly prudence so far as to ask consideration for his claims on the ground that Maryland had showed a less stubborn attachment to the cause of the Stuarts than the neighboring colony of

Virginia, though he could not have forgotten that it was to the Stuarts that he owed his dignity and estates. In this there was certainly more of calculation than of magnanimity. On the whole, we see in the Proprietary of Maryland a man of poise and moderation, calculating, watchful of his own interest, tolerant it may be from conviction, but certainly knowing well that tolerance was for his material interest in filling up his colony, and scarcely less than a necessity in maintaining his proprietary standing. That a Roman Catholic courtier should hold, under a Protestant government, such a stretch of privilege was enough by itself to provoke scrutiny in an age of intense religious jealousies. Any rumor that he was using the privilege to the serious discomfiture of Protestants would speedily have brought a tempest about his ears. For Lord Baltimore to attempt to impose disabilities on Protestants in Maryland would have been about the same madness as for De Monts to persecute Roman Catholics at Port Royal. In fact, his charter obligated him not to give an exclusive right or even a preferred place to the Roman Catholic religion, since it stipulated that churches should be consecrated according to the ecclesiastical laws of England.

The second assumption seems to have flowed mainly from the fact that the Proprietary was a Roman Catholic, and that, besides the Jesuit missionaries whom he sent out, there were no clergymen in the colony during the early part of its history. As for these grounds of judgment, it is evident that the first must yield to any positive evidence. The second can also be shown to be intrinsically weak. Any one who remembers that

Carolina was for years without any ministerial supply, though proprietors and colonists were both Protestants, will not think it remarkable that no Protestant ministers were introduced into Maryland, where the ruling head was a Roman Catholic. The lack of ministers might be sufficiently explained by the supposition that no adequate authority interested itself in the matter. This item, then, in no wise proves that Protestants were not from the first a large element in Maryland. That they were a majority is clearly indicated by several contemporary testimonies. The following three we think will be found entirely adequate to establish our conclusion: (1) Father White, one of the Jesuit missionaries who sailed with the colony, in his narrative of the voyage written near the end of 1634, says that the distribution of wine on a festival occasion was followed by sickness on the part of those who indulged too freely; and that "about twelve died, among whom were two Catholics." [1] These statistics indicate that the Protestants on board ship were the more numerous, unless perchance they were less used to wine than their Romish brethren or partook more freely. (2) A list of twenty propositions of canon law, emanating probably from Father White, was submitted by the English Provincial to the Propaganda at Rome. In the explanatory communication which the Provincial sent with the propositions this statement occurs: "In a country like this, newly planted, and depending wholly upon England for subsistence, where there is not (nor can be until England is reunited to the Church) any ecclesiasti-

[1] Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus, edited by Henry Foley, iii 345.

cal discipline established by laws of the province, or granted by the Prince, nor provincial synod held, nor spiritual courts created, nor the canon laws accepted, nor ordinary or other ecclesiastical persons admitted (as such), nor the Catholic religion publicly allowed; and whereas three parts of the people or four, at least, are heretics, I desire to be resolved "[1] [on the subjoined list of questions]. (3) Not long after the preceding communication, another was sent to the Propaganda, about the year 1642, by the Vice-Provincial of the Jesuits in England. Maryland at that time, during the temporary absence of the governor, Leonard Calvert, was under the charge of the Secretary Leugar, then a Roman Catholic, but having received his early education among Protestants. The Vice-Provincial, having recounted the main facts respecting the founding of the colony, and the sending out of the Jesuit missionaries for the conversion of heretics and natives, proceeds as follows: "The affair was surrounded with heavy and many difficulties, for in leading the colony to Maryland, by far the greater part were heretics, the country itself, *a meridie Virginiæ ab aquilone*, is esteemed likewise to be a New England, that is, two provinces full of English Calvinists and Puritans; so that not less, nay, perhaps greater dangers threaten our fathers in a foreign, than in their native land of England. Nor is the baron himself able to find support for the fathers, nor can they expect sustenance from heretics hostile to the faith, nor from Catholics for the most part poor, nor from savages, who live after the manner of wild beasts."[2] Evidently, if these Jesuit

[1] Records of the English Province, iii 362. [2] Ibid., iii. 363, 364.

correspondents are to be counted trustworthy, it must be concluded that the colony in Maryland never was preponderantly Roman Catholic.

In the light of the foregoing conclusion, there is little occasion to deal specifically with the third assumption. Surely it would be a small consolation to a Roman Catholic to be able to prove that a majority in the assembly of 1649 were Roman Catholics. Finding indubitable evidence that the Protestants were then a large majority of the people, learning moreover, that an assembly held several years before contained a majority of Protestants,[1] as did also that of 1650,[2] he must own that the act of tolerance passed in 1649 was clearly a safeguard for Roman Catholic worship and citizenship. No excessive credit, therefore, is due to Romish legislators for voting such an act, supposing its passage depended simply on them,— a conclusion not wholly free from doubt.[3] On the other hand, the Protestant members of the Assembly cannot be praised

[1] This fact appears in the letter quoted above. Complaining of Secretary Lengar as narrowing the privileges of the Romish Church, the Vice-Provincial says : "The Secretary, having summoned the Assembly in Maryland, composed with few exceptions of heretics and presided over by himself, attempted to pass the following laws repugnant to the Catholic faith and ecclesiastical immunities that no virgin can inherit unless she be twenty-nine years of age, that no ecclesiastic shall be summoned in any cause, civil or criminal, before any other than a secular judge," etc. (p. 365).

[2] E. D. Neill, Founders of Maryland, pp 122, 123; W. T Brantly, in Critical and Narrative History of America, vol. iii.

[3] It is known that the Governor and half of his council were Protestants If the council sat as a separate house, it lay in the discretion of Protestants to accept or to reject the act. What proportion of the burgesses were Protestant is not fully determined.

very greatly, unless it be concluded that they were better and wiser than their successors, who in after times disfranchised the Roman Catholics in Maryland. Probably the pleasure of the Governor and the Proprietary was quite as influential with them as an intelligent love for tolerance As respects the compass of the act of tolerance, it was drawn in very broad and generous terms for Trinitarian Christians; for Jews and Unitarians, on the contrary, it bespoke very scant charity, making them liable to capital punishment for any declaration of their special tenets.

The act of toleration was renewed in 1676. But the Revolution of 1689 brought an unhappy change to the Roman Catholic minority. Through a large part of the next century they were restricted in the public exercise of their religion and placed under political disabilities.

The Revolutionary War was an era of emancipation for Roman Catholics, though still at its close the statute-books in a few of the States did not concede to them the right to hold political offices. It has been estimated that they numbered in 1783 about sixteen thousand in Maryland, seven thousand in Pennsylvania, fifteen hundred in the other States, and about four thousand in the western territories on the Ohio and the Mississippi, which at this time were ceded by Great Britain.[1]

The organization of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in this country dates from the year 1789, when the Pope authorized the erection of the episcopal see of

[1] De Courcey and Shea, History of the Catholic Church in the United States, pp 53, 54.

Baltimore. The first bishop, John Carroll, belonged to a Maryland family which took an honored part in the struggle for nationality, and is justly remembered himself as a man of culture, discretion, and ability.

V. — CHURCH OF ENGLAND ESTABLISHMENTS, AND THE FOUNDING OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

The Church of England in the colonies was, as respects spiritual jurisdiction, an extension of the bishopric of London. As respects its general character, it was a rather feeble reflection of the Establishment on English soil. It lacked the requisite number of ministers. This was especially the case before the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts began its helpful activity (1701). About four fifths of the parishes in Virginia were vacant at the Restoration, and nearly half were in like destitution sixty years later. Carolina for almost twenty years had no clergyman. In Maryland, before the reinforcement at the end of the seventeenth century, the Church of England had no more than three clerical representatives. Not more than six could be found at that time on the whole Atlantic border, outside of Virginia and Maryland. The aggregate for the entire country probably did not reach fifty. Nor was this the whole of the deficiency. Among those sent into the field, the proportion of men who possessed at once marked ability and spirituality was not large. Virginia, it is true, recorded in her early annals the name of Alexander Whitaker, whose talents and devotion promised a very useful career, had

it not been closed by a premature death (1617). Later the colony had occasion to remember gratefully James Blair. To him was largely due the founding of William and Mary College, the first commencement of which was held in 1700. Near the same time the Church in Maryland obtained an efficient servant in James Bray, who, like Blair, acted as commissary of the Bishop of London. George Keith, the distinguished convert from Quakerism, in his missionary tour through the colonies (1702–1704) displayed enough controversial skill to vex the great majority of his former associates in faith, and to win a minority to his side. In New England, from the time that Timothy Cutler, the president of Yale College, became a convert to the episcopal theory (1722) Anglicanism had very creditable representatives in that quarter. Still, the statement must be allowed that through much of the colonial era the Church of England on this side of the Atlantic was but poorly blessed in the quality of its ministry. The conditions were not such as to attract men of talent and enterprise, except perchance the few who heard a Macedonian call in their hearts. A perfunctory discharge of the ordinary parish duties, supplemented by a life that was none too persuasive on the side of godliness, was all that could be expected of a great part of the candidates who presented themselves to the Bishop of London for the American field.

As Virginia was the oldest colony, so it preceded all others, by a considerable interval, in the matter of a church establishment affiliating with that of England. In harmony also with the time when it originated, the Virginia Establishment was distinguished by a greater

exclusiveness than any other of those under the episcopal régime in America. The "oath of supremacy" was early imposed upon emigrants to the colony, as a bar against Roman Catholics. When a reinforcement was about to embark in 1609, the spirited preacher William Crashaw, in a sermon before the patrons of the enterprise, deprecated the allowance of any Brownists or factious separatists within the settlement. In its earlier years the colony seems not to have been much troubled with foreign ingredients. But by 1642 it was found that men with nonconforming tastes had gained a foothold, and in such numbers that they thought it desirable to have some Puritan ministers imported from Boston. But the colonial legislature was not willing to tolerate this encroachment. By an act of 1643 it forbade any minister to teach or preach, in public or in private, except in conformity to the constitutions of the Church of England, and instructed the Governor and council to compel all nonconformists to depart "with all conveniencie."[1] Six years later a considerable company found it necessary to make their exit from Virginia, and took refuge in Maryland. A cold reception was also accorded to the Quakers. Ordinances of 1661–63 subjected them to heavy fines for attending conventicles, and directed that a third offence should entail upon them, as also upon other separatists, the penalty of banishment. Shipmasters bringing Quakers into the country were to be visited with like punishments.[2] The Baptists, who made their appearance in the next century, were not a whit more wel-

[1] W. W. Hening, Laws of Virginia, i. 277.
[2] Ibid., ii. 48, 180, 181.

come to the Virginia churchmen, and received a liberal share of stripes and imprisonment. In short, the Establishment in Virginia proved very clearly its sense of exclusive right in that province. The remaining colonies, on the other hand, which had a Church of England establishment, being founded at a time when tolerance had obtained a larger recognition, did not in general place any serious restraint upon the worship of dissenting Protestants.

Ecclesiastical discipline in Virginia, had the practice followed the laws, would have been sufficiently strict. A code which had place between 1610 and 1619 would not seem feeble even when compared with that which Calvin and his associates introduced into Geneva. Among its provisions were the following: "No man shall speak any word, or do any act which may tend to the derision or despite of God's holy Word, upon pain of death. Nor shall any man unworthily demean himself unto any preacher or minister of the same, but generally hold them in all reverent regard and dutiful intreaty; otherwise he, the offender, shall openly be whipped three times, and ask public forgiveness in the assembly of the congregation three several Sabbath days. Every man and woman duly twice a day, upon the first tolling of the bell, shall upon the working days repair unto the church to hear divine service, upon pain of losing his or her day's allowance for the first omission; for the second to be whipped; and for the third to be condemned to the galleys for six months. Also every man and woman shall repair in the morning to divine service, and sermon preached upon the Sabbath day, and in the afternoon to divine service and

catechising; upon pain for the first fault to lose their provision and allowance for the whole week following; for the second, to lose the said allowance, and also to be whipped; and for the third to suffer death."[1] It is no wonder that after a few years it was thought necessary to modify this merciless code. Nevertheless, it was deemed proper to sustain by statute the obligation to attend the Sunday service. As late as the beginning of the eighteenth century laws were passed subjecting to fines those voluntarily absenting themselves from the sanctuary.

Between the ideal set forth in the legislation and the practice there was undoubtedly a rather broad chasm. The free-going Virginia planters were not disposed to pay any excessive regard to religious restraints. In some of the parishes a strict preacher was at a discount. In all the parishes, during a good share of the period, laymen had the means of keeping out those whose pastoral rigor and fidelity might prove troublesome, since the vestries governed the settling of the ministers. This subjection to local and lay authority was regarded by one and another critic as very prejudicial to the health of the Establishment. Morgan Godwyn, referring to the years preceding the Bacon rebellion (1676), declared that the ministers were so miserably treated by the vestries as to suffer greater discouragements than those which befell the clergy in England during the time of the Puritan usurpation. A curious testimony on the state and character of the clergy at this time, and a still more curious indication respecting

[1] F. L. Hawks, Rise and Progress of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Virginia, pp. 25, 26.

the enlightenment of their civil head, are given in the following from Governor Berkeley: "Our ministers are well paid, and by my consent would be better if they would pray oftener and preach less. But as of all other commodities, so of this, the worst are sent us, and we have few that we could boast of since the persecution in Cromwell's tyranny drove divers worthy men here. But, I thank God, there are no free schools, nor printing; and I hope we shall not have [them] these hundred years; for learning has brought disobedience and heresy and sects into the world, and printing has divulged them and libels against the best government." [1]

In the Carolina provinces an exclusive right was not claimed for the Church of England. All Protestant settlers were allowed to choose their own worship, provided they treated the Episcopal Church with respect, and were obedient to the government. Nevertheless, it was the design of both King and Proprietors to extend the home establishment to the Carolinas. One of the articles of the Fundamental Constitutions declared that the religion of the Church of England, being the national religion of all the King's dominions, should also be that of Carolina, and should alone receive public maintenance by legislative grant. Another article in the Constitutions approached the theocratic régime of Massachusetts Bay and of New Haven as respects the conditions of citizenship. It contained this provision: "No person above seventeen years of age shall have any benefit or protection of the law, or be capable of any place of profit or honor who is not a member of

[1] J. S. M. Anderson, History of the Church of England in the Colonies, ii. 348.

some church or profession, having his name recorded in some one, and but one, religious record, at once."

The Fundamental Constitutions, as has been observed, received scant recognition in practice. As respects the erection of a church establishment, some time elapsed before there was any proper provision for religious worship; and it was first at the beginning of the eighteenth century that the colonial legislature made legal provision for the maintenance of the Church of England. There was an attempt at this time to disfranchise dissenters, but the violent scheme was quickly thwarted.

A heterogeneous community like that of the Carolinas, which had suffered comparative neglect for so long a period, did not of course present very select materials for a religious organization. The situation must indeed have been desperate, if we are to accept the description given by Gideon Johnson, who served as the commissary of the Bishop of London. "The people here," he wrote, "generally speaking, are the vilest race of men upon the earth. They have neither honor nor honesty, nor religion enough to entitle them to any tolerable character, being a perfect medley or hotch-potch, made up of bankrupt pirates, decayed libertines, sectaries, and enthusiasts of all sorts who have transported themselves hither from Bermudas, Jamaica, Barbadoes, Montserat, Antego, Nevis, New England, Pennsylvania, etc., and are the most factious and seditious people in the whole world. Many of those that pretend to be churchmen are strangely crippled in their goings between the Church and Presbytery, and as they are of large and loose principles, so

they live and act accordingly, sometimes going openly with the Dissenters, as they now do against the Church, and giving incredible trouble to the Governor and clergy." [1] In this the worthy commissary gives doubtless the dark side of the subject. Perhaps in a different mood he might have let in a little light upon the scene, though leaving it still a sombre sketch. Notwithstanding the cheerless outlook which he records, he was able to lay a foundation for better things.

Among those who succeeded to the superintendence of the Church in South Carolina, Commissary Garden won some celebrity by his attempt to bring Whitefield to account for his irregular labors (1740–1742). The champion of law and order had the satisfaction of freeing his conscience; but so far as putting a check on the winged evangelist was concerned, he might as well have laid his injunction against the wind.

The Revolution of 1689, when the government of Maryland passed out of the hands of the Baltimore family until the heir was announced to be a Protestant (1715), was followed by the establishing of the Church of England in that colony. Action in that direction was taken in 1692, and ten years later a full legislative sanction had been secured for the project of establishment.

In outward respects the legal church in Maryland was one of the most favored. A large proportion of the people were numbered among its adherents, and the ministers had on the average no reason to complain of their salaries. "In no part of America were the clergy half so well supported," says a careful writer, speak-

[1] W. S. Perry, History of the American Episcopal Church, i. 379.

ing of the time just preceding the War of Independence. Had the interests of vital religion been equally well sustained, the Maryland Church might well have been the subject of many and hearty congratulations. But that appears not to have been the case. For the same author whom we have just quoted, though writing as a friendly historian, declares that the Establishment in Maryland justly forfeited respect, on account of the scandals which were comparatively unrebuked in the lack of strict discipline.[1]

In New Jersey the Church of England held legally a preferred place, in that a general tax might be levied for its support. In other respects dissenting communions stood on a basis of equality; moreover, very little, if any, use seems to have been made of the legal preference which was given to the Church of England. The same order of statements describes the ecclesiastical status of Georgia. In both provinces the Church of England was largely a missionary institute, depending, as it did in New England and Pennsylvania (outside of a few places), upon the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.

The adherents of the Church of England in New York were but a handful in the first years after the English occupation, and at the end of the seventeenth century they numbered no more than one tenth of the population. This inferiority in numbers stood naturally in the way of exclusive privileges. For a time the Dutch Presbyterians claimed quite as much the character of an established church as did the Episcopalians.

[1] F. L. Hawks, Rise and Progress of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Maryland, pp. 236, 237.

James II. seems to have had it in mind to abolish this equality. In his instructions to Governor Dongan in 1686 he prescribed as a condition of preferment to any benefice, or induction into the office of schoolmaster, that the candidate should present a license from the Archbishop of Canterbury. The intent contained in these instructions was taken up some years later by the English Governors. Fletcher and Cornbury (1692–1708) were notably zealous for an established ministry. The majority of the colonists looked upon their efforts as an unjustifiable aggression; still they allowed them to be partially successful. The maintenance of worship in Trinity Church was provided for by a general tax upon the city of New York, and a number of Episcopal churches in other places also had the benefit of a tax levied upon the townsmen generally. Near the middle of the eighteenth century a support for the Church of England interest was furnished in the founding of King's College. The first commencement of the college was held in 1758, one year after that of the kindred institution in Philadelphia. The first president was Samuel Johnson, who ranked perhaps as the ablest of the Connecticut ministers. One of the graduates of the year 1758 was Samuel Provoost, the first representative of New York among the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

Mason and Gorges, who held grants in New Hampshire and Maine, were churchmen, and doubtless were minded to provide an established ministry for these territories. But their colonies never acquired an extent and stability that admitted of anything more than feeble beginnings of an ecclesiastical system.

In Massachusetts the first monument to prelacy which afflicted the eyes of the Puritans was built during the abhorred administration of Andros. It bore the name of King's Chapel, and dates from the year 1689. Christ Church was added in 1723, and Trinity Church in 1734.

A pleasing episode in the New England annals was made by the visit of the genial and talented George Berkeley, then Dean of Derry, later Bishop of Cloyne. For nearly three years he lived at Newport (1729–1731), a part of the time being employed in the writing of his philosophical dialogue, the "Alciphron." The object of his coming was the foundation of a university, to be located at the Bermudas, and to serve as a great nursery of culture and religion in America. The failure of the English government to furnish the promised endowment thwarted his scheme, and he was compelled to return with the discouraging reflection that he had been employed upon a vain errand. Nevertheless, his zeal for the cause of learning in the new world was not destined to be without its substantial memorial. In the founding of scholarships at Yale College, and in the gift of books to both Yale and Harvard he rendered a service in which his catholicity, as well as his generosity, came to expression.

At the beginning of the Revolutionary struggle there were perhaps in the whole country from Maine to Georgia three hundred congregations and two hundred and fifty ministers connected with the Church of England. At the close of the war it is not probable that more than half that number of ministers could be found, and the congregations which could boast of regular

services had been reduced in nearly equal ratio.[1] This depletion was due in no inconsiderable measure to the royalist position of the clergy. While a part of them zealously espoused the cause of American independence, an equal or larger proportion were too strongly attached to the mother country to welcome a separation. This was naturally the feeling of the missionary clergy, whose commission and support came alike from the other side of the Atlantic. In South Carolina the loyalist clergy were in the minority, constituting, it is said, only one fourth of the whole; but in Virginia and Maryland they were about double the number of those who sided with the colonies. This fact was evidently unfavorable to the continued maintenance of the establishments. Probably, had the case been different, the advance of sentiment in favor of disconnecting Church and State would ere long have brought disestablishment. As it was, disestablishment came with the first notes of independence.

During a large part of the colonial era it was felt by the clergy to be a serious disadvantage that there was no resident bishop on the American side. Those in-

[1] Not all regions suffered as much as Virginia, but some certainly did not fare much better. The extent of the desolation which visited the Virginia churches may be seen in the following statement: "When the colonists first resorted to arms, Virginia, in her sixty-one counties, contained ninety-five parishes, one hundred and sixty-four churches and chapels, and ninety-one clergymen. When the contest was over she came out of the war with a large number of her churches destroyed or injured irreparably, with twenty-three of her ninety-five parishes extinct or forsaken, and of the remaining seventy-two, thirty-four were destitute of ministerial services; while of her ninety-one clergymen, twenty-eight only remained, who had lived through the storm." (Hawks, Hist. of the Episcopal Church in Virginia, p. 154.)

terested for the good name of the ministry grieved over this destitution, as making it impossible to maintain suitable discipline; and generally it was considered that candidates for orders were made to pay an excessive price, in that they were required to cross the sea in order to reach episcopal hands. As early as the time of Charles II. a proposal was made to supply a bishop to Virginia. Indeed, one was actually designated to the post, but for some reason he was never sent, and the design was abandoned. In the next century many urgent requests came to England for a bishop. That they did not elicit a favorable response has been ascribed to the strong opposition of the Dissenters, who no doubt were much agitated over the subject, since in their view a bishop, as the close ally of the English Establishment and the English crown, would be for them a forerunner of both ecclesiastical and political subordination. These objections the Episcopal party endeavored to answer by assurances that a bishop in America would not claim any jurisdiction or authority beyond the administration of religion among those accepting him as their ecclesiastical head. As respects the merits of the contention, we cannot well reach a more definite or impartial verdict than that which is embraced in the following words of Bishop White: "What would have been the event, in this respect, had the Episcopal clergy succeeded in their desires, is a problem which it will be forever impossible to solve. In regard to the motives of the parties in the dispute, there are circumstances which charity may apply to the most favorable interpretation. As the Episcopal clergy disclaimed the designs and expectations of which they

were accused, and as the same was done by their advocates on the other side of the water, particularly by the principal of them, the great and good Archbishop Secker, they ought to be supposed to have had in view an episcopacy purely religious. On the other hand, as their opponents laid aside their resistance of the religious part of it as soon as American independence had done away all political danger, if it before existed, it ought to be believed that in their former professed apprehensions they were sincere." [1]

The sundering of the bonds with the mother country evidently left the Episcopal churches in the several colonies or States without any recognized bond of connection. If there was to be a united Episcopal Church for the whole country, it must be erected by concerted action. After some preliminary conferences provision was made for such action by assembling a convention at Philadelphia in 1785. This meeting submitted, for the consideration of the several State conventions, a constitution or plan of government, and also a model for a prayer-book. The character of the latter indicates that the compilers could not be ranked as conservatives. The Athanasian and Nicene creeds were rejected, the clause respecting Christ's descent into hell was eliminated from the Apostles' Creed, the thirty-nine articles were reduced to twenty, and a number of alterations were made in the liturgy. The "Proposed Book" proved to be too radical in its departures from the English prayer-book. At the convention of 1786 the Nicene Creed was restored, and also the clause which

[1] Memoirs of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, pp. 6, 7.

had been ejected from the Apostles' Creed. Definitive action on the articles of religion was not taken till a later period (1801), when it was concluded not to modify the thirty-nine articles any farther than the changed conditions required.

In 1787 William White of Pennsylvania, and Samuel Provoost of New York obtained consecration to the episcopacy from the English bishops. Three years earlier the representative of the Connecticut clergy, Samuel Seabury, had been consecrated by the non-juring bishops of Scotland. As some objection was felt to Seabury, there was a danger of division in the ranks of the Episcopalians. But judicious management bridged over the difficulty; and at the convention of 1789 the New England bishop united with those representing other portions of the country. From this convention we may date the relative completion of the organization of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

As in case of the prayer-book the movement was from a radical to a more conservative position, so also in relation to episcopal authority. As first accepted at the convention of 1789, the constitution left the power of legislation almost entirely in the hands of the house of deputies, composed in part of the clergy, and in part of the laity. The bishops could simply review measures, approving them, or returning them with their objections, in which case the house of deputies could override the objections by a stipulated majority. This inequality was in part rectified before the conclusion of the convention, in that the power of the bishop to initiate measures was specified. Still the bishops were not placed on a basis of co-ordination with the other

branch of a general convention. It was first in 1808 that they attained this position, by being empowered to render an unqualified veto upon the measures proposed by the house of deputies.

At the initial stage the dominant temper of the Protestant Episcopal body was undoubtedly Low Church. There may have been a strain of High Churchism in Bishop Seabury; but Bishop White, the master spirit in the era of organization, occupied a freer stand-point, and we are constrained to believe that he represented in this the larger constituency. In a pamphlet which he prepared in 1782 he gave the opinion that the validity of church organization is not strictly dependent upon episcopal succession. This view he continued to hold; for as late as 1830 we find him referring to the production of his early years in these terms: "In agreement with the sentiments expressed in this pamphlet I am still of opinion that in an exigency in which duly authorized ministers cannot be obtained, the paramount duty of preaching the gospel, and the worshipping of God on the terms of the Christian covenant should go on in the best manner which circumstances permit. In regard to episcopacy, I think that it should be sustained as the government of the Church from the time of the Apostles, but without criminating the ministry of other churches."[1] That his position was remote from the Tractarian plane may also be concluded from the following statement in his Memoirs: "It will be a most important use of the review to notice the undeviating intention of the Church to make no such alterations as shall interfere with the maintaining of

[1] W. S. Perry, History of the American Episcopal Church, ii. 9.

the doctrines of the gospel, as acknowledged at the Reformation. That point of time should be kept in mind, in order to protect the Church, not only against threatened innovations from without, but also against others which have occasionally showed their heads in the Church of England, and may show their heads in this church, betraying a lurking fondness for errors which had been abandoned."[1]

The Protestant Episcopal Church may have produced men who are entitled to be counted the equals or superiors of Bishop White in scholarship and ability. But that among its eminent representatives it can point to a single one who has been characterized by a more exemplary spirit, we greatly doubt. There would be a much wider harmony in the ecclesiastical world if questions in controversy were commonly approached with the courtesy and judicial temper which were manifested by William White, Bishop of Pennsylvania.

James Madison, the first bishop of Virginia, shared in the irenic temper of Bishop White. It was at his instance that the bishops in 1792 adopted the following minute in behalf of Christian union: "The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, ever bearing in mind the sacred obligation which attends all the followers of Christ to avoid divisions among themselves, and anxious to promote that union for which our Lord and Saviour so earnestly prayed, do hereby declare to the Christian world that, uninfluenced by any other considerations than those of duty as Christians, and an earnest desire for the prosperity of pure Christianity, and the furtherance of our holy

[1] Memoirs of the Protestant Episcopal Church, p. 316.

religion, they are ready to unite and form one body with any religious society which shall be influenced by the same catholic spirit. And in order that this Christian end may be the more easily effected, they further declare that all things in which the great essentials of Christianity or the characteristic principles of their church are not concerned, they are willing to leave to future discussion, being ready to alter or modify those points which, in the opinion of the Protestant Episcopal Church, are subject to human alteration. And it is hereby recommended to the State conventions to adopt such measures or propose such conferences with Christians of other denominations as to themselves may be thought most prudent, and report accordingly to the ensuing general convention."[1] The union scheme of Bishop Madison had more immediate reference to the Methodists. As it failed to obtain the approbation of the house of deputies, its enunciation led to no further action.

VI. — CONGREGATIONAL ESTABLISHMENTS.

Cotton Mather begins his ecclesiastical history of New England with these words: "I write the wonders of the Christian religion, flying from the depravations of Europe to the American strand." Many writers besides, if they have not made use of equally grandiloquent phrase, have regarded the migration of the

[1] Bishop White, Memoirs of the Protestant Episcopal Church, pp. 208–210; W. S. Perry, History of the American Episcopal Church, ii. 126. It is proper to add that we have used the valuable work of Bishop Perry more largely than the list of references indicates.

Puritans to these shores with a kindred interest, and have looked upon their work here as a most important contribution to religion and civilization. On the other hand, there have been not a few reviewers who have scarcely been able to mention Puritan New England without having recourse to the vocabulary of disparagement and invective. The explanation of these contrasted judgments is easily found. The sight has followed the inward bias, and that has been seen which was most sought after. Like a strong personality, in whom virtues and faults alike rise above mediocrity, New England in its early history exhibited diverse traits. Much that appears in the record a healthy mind must ever revere. At the same time some things come to view which a well-furnished and well-balanced mind can never admire. Probably the easiest way to dispose of the latter elements would be to charge them upon the age. But this would only divide, not eliminate, responsibility. He surely would be guilty of great boldness who should dare to affirm that the age ought not to have been better than it was. It remains, moreover, to show that the age provided nothing which could have helped the Puritans to correct their faults.

Developing the subject by topics, we will notice in the first place the church polity of the New England settlements.

The Plymouth colony represented the principles of separatism and independency. Its leaders taught the need of departing from the prelatical establishment of England, and assigned to the individual congregation the prerogative of self-rule. The separatism, however, which was represented at Plymouth was not of the

most radical cast; it was rather the ameliorated form which was held by John Robinson in his later years. Softened by age and experience, this eminent teacher instructed the pilgrim company, as they were departing for America, to believe that "the Lord had more truth and light yet to break forth out of His Holy Word." [1] In practical accord with the tolerance underlying this view, he allowed that protest against the errors of the English establishment need not necessarily be carried to the extreme of refusing altogether to hear the preaching and prayers of godly men in the ranks of its ministry. His position was thus defined by one of his disciples: "He was more rigid in his course and way at first than towards his latter end; for his study was peace and union so far as might agree with faith and a good conscience; and for schism and division, there was nothing in the world more hateful to him. But for the government of the Church of England, as it was in the Episcopal way, the liturgy and stinted prayers of the Church there, yea, the constitution of it as national, and so, consequently, the corrupt communion of the unworthy with the worthy receivers of the Lord's Supper, —these things were never approved of him, but wit-

[1] H. M. Dexter concludes that a broader sense has sometimes been given to these words than was put into them by their author. He thinks they were designed to refer almost entirely, if not exclusively, to polity. (Congregationalism, as seen in its Literature, pp. 404–410.) While allowing the justice of some limitation, we are disposed to think that it is carried farther than is necessary by Dr. Dexter. No doubt Robinson was satisfied with the Calvinistic doctrines and very ready to defend them in detail. Still, that in his premonition of coming light he consciously excluded doctrine, as believing that the very acme of insight in that sphere had already been reached, we see no adequate reason to infer.

nessed against to his death, and are by the church over which he was, to this day." [1]

In the colony of Massachusetts Bay the declared platform was, at the start, nonconformity rather than separatism. In other words, the Puritan emigrants to that quarter advocated not so much a substitute for the Church of England as a reform of certain obnoxious particulars in its ceremonies and administration. At their departure from England they felt free to speak of the Establishment in very friendly terms. Thus Francis Higginson, who came to Salem in 1629, remarked: "We will not say, as the Separatists were wont to say at their leaving, 'Farewell, Babylon! Farewell, Rome!' But we will say, 'Farewell, dear England! Farewell, the Church of God in England, and all the Christian friends there!' We do not go to New England as Separatists from the Church of England, though we cannot but separate from the corruptions in it; but we go to practise the positive part of church reformation, and propagate the gospel in America." The sailing of Winthrop's company in the next year was preceded by a printed and published address, in which the emigrants spoke of the Church of England as their "dear mother," and declared that the sadness and tears from which they could not refrain on leaving their native country were due largely to the thought that that country was the place of her special residence. It is not necessary to question the sincerity of these expressions. The ordeal of severance from the homes of their childhood naturally called out whatever of underlying affection for England and its institutions existed in

[1] Edward Winslow, quoted by Dexter, p. 406.

the hearts of the departing Puritans. At the same time, these expressions did not represent their whole thought or feeling. The ecclesiastical opinions which placed them at variance with the Establishment were tenaciously held, and a position of entire independence of its shackles was intrinsically agreeable to them. Hence we have the record that the churches of Massachusetts Bay proceeded from the first very much as though the Church of England had no existence. They stood practically on the basis of separatism, and there was not enough difference between their polity and that in vogue at Plymouth to occasion any controversy. "The New England Puritans," says Governor Hutchinson, "when at full liberty, went the full length which the Separatists did in England. It does not follow that they would have done so if they had remained in England. Upon their removal they supposed their relation both to the civil and ecclesiastical government, except so far as a special reserve was made by their charter, was at an end, and that they had right to form such new model of both as best pleased them. In the form of worship, they universally followed the New Plymouth Church."[1] The general model supplied by the older colonies was adopted in Connecticut and New Haven.

In the relation of the churches to each other the primitive New England scheme seems to have been substantially identical with that of later Congregationalism. But in the government of the individual church, the prevailing theory, if we may judge from statements in the oldest extant writings on the subject, had a de-

[1] History of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, i. 418.

cided spice of aristocracy. While the congregation elected the officers, it was not thought fitting that it should have any co-ordinate place with them in governing. "Our Fathers," says Dexter, "laid it down that the will of Christ, and not the will of the major or minor part of a church, ought to govern that church. But somebody must interpret that will. And they quietly assumed that Christ would reveal his will to the elders, but would not reveal it to the church members; so that when there arose a difference of opinion as to what the Master's will might be touching any particular matter, the judgment of the elders, rather than the judgment even of a majority of the membership, must be taken as conclusive." [1]

In association with the pastors (and teachers) the early churches had "ruling elders." As defined by the Cambridge synod of 1648, their work was "to join with the pastor and teacher in those acts of spiritual rule which are distinct from the ministry of the Word and sacraments committed to them." They were expected to take a large share in matters of discipline. The office was continued for a considerable interval; but experience finally led many to conclude that the duties of a ruling elder were not sufficiently diverse from those of a pastor to make it necessary to provide an extra official. At the beginning of the next century ruling elders had well-nigh vanished. "Partly through a prejudice against the office," wrote Cotton Mather, "and partly, indeed chiefly, through a penury of men well qualified for the discharge of it, as it has been heretofore understood and applied, our churches are

[1] Congregationalism, as seen in its Literature, p. 429.

now generally destitute of such helps in government."[1]

The conditions of membership were sufficiently strict in the early times of the Puritan colonies. A few years after the settlement of Massachusetts Bay, it became customary in most churches for the candidate to give a narrative of his religious experience before the congregation. Since this was too crossing to some dispositions, it was provided in the Cambridge platform that those who shrank from the public ordeal could make their profession before the elders, and then in the presence of the congregation simply assent to the elders' report.[2] As the requisition for this order of examination implies, conversion was regarded as strictly necessary for membership. The Church was understood to be the household of the regenerate.

This view, in connection with the importance attached to baptism as a seal of the covenant, gave rise ere long to a practical difficulty. It was found that a considerable proportion of the second generation of colonists did not feel qualified to make such profession as was required for admission into the churches. In this way many children were left without any title to baptism. As this was felt to be a grievance, a movement originated, shortly after the middle of the century, first in Connecticut and then in the neighboring colonies, for obtaining a remedy. The result was the so-called "half-way covenant." At a synod held in

[1] Magnalia, ii. 206 (ed. 1820). As the so-called "teacher" was less remote in function from the pastor than the ruling elder, there was still less occasion to conserve the distinctive title and office.

[2] Magnalia, ii. 210.

Boston in 1662, it was decided that baptized persons who understood the grounds of religion, and were not scandalous in their lives, although they were not yet fit for full communion, ought to own the covenant, and that their children should then be counted eligible to baptism. Some of the most stanch and thoughtful of the ministers were opposed to so serious a relaxation in the conditions of membership. The measure, nevertheless, was carried by a large majority, and though a spirited opposition was kept up for a time, the practice of the churches gradually was conformed to the new and more indulgent standard. In some instances, concession was carried a step farther, and those who in their religious estate simply met the description of subjects of the half-way covenant were admitted to the Lord's Supper. Some conceived that there was abundant ground for making this practice general, since the Lord's Supper, so far from necessarily implying antecedent regeneration in the communicant, was designed to be a means of regeneration. Thus Solomon Stoddard argued in 1700. With this departure from the old strictness, there naturally ensued a change in the religious tone of the churches, as will be noticed subsequently.

While there was a movement to a lessened stringency in the administration of the individual church, an agitation began for strengthening the connectional system, or the authority of the general body over the single congregation. In Connecticut there resulted a species of compromise with Presbyterianism, as appears from the functions assigned to Associations and Consociations by the Saybrook Platform in 1708. In Massachusetts

a similar scheme was proposed, but with a reverse result. The discussion which was provoked nurtured ultimately a firmer adherence to the congregational principle, the genuine Brownist doctrine that the individual church is not to be overruled by any extraneous authority, its proper independence, while consisting with advice, not allowing dictation or judicial determination from without. In securing this outcome, an important part was fulfilled by John Wise, a zealous advocate of a democratic constitution for both State and Church.

In the New England system there was no wide separation between the civil and the ecclesiastical domain. Church and State were very intimately associated. In two of the colonies the franchise could be reached only by admission into the Church. Massachusetts ordained in 1631 that no one should be admitted to the freedom of the body politic but such as were members of some of the churches in her jurisdiction. A like provision was adopted by New Haven. In Plymouth and Connecticut the conferring of the franchise was dependent upon the vote or recommendation of the body of freemen in the several towns. "But it may reasonably be believed that church membership was also in Plymouth and Connecticut much regarded by the electors as a qualification of candidates for citizenship." [1] In Massachusetts the restriction was maintained with little practical abatement till the cancelling of the charter and the appointment of royal governors. It is true that an act was passed in 1664 allowing freeholders possessed of a certain amount of property, and recom-

[1] Palfrey, History of New England.

mended as orthodox and moral, to be eligible to the franchise, without being members of the churches. But, as Governor Hutchinson gives us to understand, the legal provision was not followed by any appreciable change in practice till the dissolution of the charter government and the introduction of royal governors.[1] In New Haven the restriction on the franchise continued till the incorporation of that colony with Connecticut.

The connection between Church and State was also illustrated in the matter of ministerial support. The principle of voluntary contributions was not entirely discarded; but the several colonies authorized the imposition of a general tax upon the people of a township, where the salary of the minister was not otherwise provided. In another way also those who were not members were required to acknowledge their obligations to the Church, in that they were subject to fine for non-attendance upon the appointed services.

If to the above we add, that the magistrates were expected to show a vigorous determination to realize the Biblical model, and to restrain and punish all outward acts contrary to the Word of the Lord, we have about the whole ground and occasion for styling the Puritan rule in New England a theocracy. The priestly and prophetical claims which sometimes are associated with that name had no place in the Puritan scheme. A would-be prophet, or medium of divine revelation, was looked upon with great disfavor. The written Word, interpreted by the ordinary faculties with which pious men are endowed, was made the standard. No

[1] History of Massachusetts Bay, i. 26.

one, no class, was understood to have a monopoly of interpretation, and theological discussion was a very common engagement in all ranks and circles. The ministers in their theoretical position were but the first among brethren. Nevertheless, it is to be conceded that they exerted a more than average influence upon public affairs. The general anxiety to follow Scriptural precedents tended to increase the measure of consultation with them, since they were deemed to be specially versed in the teachings of the Bible. As a class, too, the early New England ministers were well fitted to command respect and deference. A large proportion of them had been educated in the English universities. Some of them, both in character and talents, may be accounted men of eminence and distinction. The impression made by John Cotton and Thomas Hooker, the one connected with Boston, and the other with the founding and early history of the Connecticut colony, is no mean tribute to their worth. A contemporary and co-laborer of the former has left this report of his ministrations: "Mr. Cotton preaches with such authority, demonstration, and life, that methinks, when he preaches out of any prophet or apostle, I hear not him, I hear that very prophet and apostle; yea, I hear the Lord Jesus Christ Himself speaking in my heart." His writings indicate self-control and moderation of spirit, and the same traits are said to have been reflected in his life. Once a censorious brother told him that his ministry was become generally either dark or flat. The quiet answer was: "Both, brother, it may be both. Let me have your prayers that it may be otherwise." But, if in temper he was a Melanchthon,

in theology he had the genuine Puritan appetite for Calvin. "'I have read the fathers,' said he, 'and the schoolmen, and Calvin too; but I find that he that has Calvin has them all;' and being asked why in his latter days he indulged nocturnal studies more than formerly, he replied, 'Because I love to sweeten my mouth with a piece of Calvin before I go to sleep.'"[1] In pulpit talent Hooker probably took precedence of Cotton. Combining great vigor of spirit with a commanding presence, and selecting ordinarily the practical themes of the gospel, he preached with marked power and effect. One who observed his energy and straightforwardness in his ministry declared of him: "He was a person who, while doing his Master's work, would put a king in his pocket."[2] Aside from his reputation as a minister, Hooker is justly reckoned among the eminent forerunners and exponents of democratic principles. In a sermon which he preached before the General Court of Connecticut in 1638 he gave as clear an assertion of the proper sovereignty of the people as can be found in our annals.[3]

From considering the connection between Church and State, we naturally pass to the most sombre phase of New England history, the persecution of dissent; since this connection was undoubtedly among the occa-

[1] Cotton Mather, Magnalia, i. 250.

[2] Magnalia, i. 313.

[3] The following were his main propositions: "The foundation of authority is laid, firstly, in the free consent of the people. . . . The choice of public magistrates belongs unto the people, by God's own allowance. . . . They who have power to appoint officers and magistrates, it is in their power also to set the bounds and limitations of the power and place unto which they call them." (J. H. Trumbull, Historical Notes on the Constitutions of Connecticut, pp. 6, 7.)

sions of that persecution. On this theme, we have to deal mainly with Massachusetts. The other Puritan colonies, whatever may have been their maxims, made no conspicuous record for intolerance. Not one of them persecuted any religious party more than Virginia persecuted the Baptists, or New York, the Quakers.

In palliation of the scant charity which Massachusetts exhibited toward uncongenial immigrants, it has been said that the colony, being planted in the midst of a boundless expanse of unoccupied country, considered it entirely right and humane to practise a certain exclusiveness, regarding the land included in their patent as pre-empted territory; just as was done, for example, during a long period, by the Hudson Bay Company with their extensive tract. Those who were not prepared to harmonize with the system which the colony had chosen to establish might properly, as they conceived, be advised to make their home elsewhere. This plea has, without doubt, a foundation in fact. But it does not express the whole motive and animus of the persecution. When we find such a man as Winthrop hinting that the massacre of three hundred Virginians by the Indians was a providential infliction which they had earned by refusing to entertain the ministers sent from Boston,[1] it becomes apparent that the Massachusetts Puritans regarded their system as entitled to a right of way outside of their special jurisdiction. They claimed an exclusiveness for themselves which they were not ready to justify in others. As against all prelatical systems on the one hand and all liberalism on the other, they believed that they had the

[1] Winthrop's History of New England, ii. 198.

truth of God, and were but manifesting a righteous zeal in defending it, if need be, by the infliction of pains and penalties. An excess of confidence as respects knowing the mind of the Lord, which was a characteristic infirmity of Puritanism in England, distempered not a little the tone of Puritan thought and administration on this side of the Atlantic. Political expediency, or the harmony and stability of the State, was indeed a motive in the persecutions, but with this was blended a somewhat bigoted sense of a vocation to defend and avenge divine truths.[1]

In the first prominent instance of procedure against dissent in Massachusetts the political motive was domi-

[1] Something like an index of the dogmatic confidence which prevailed may be seen in the following extract from the Massachusetts law-book printed in 1672: "Although no human power be lord over the faith and consciences of men, yet because such as bring in damnable heresies, tending to the subversion of the Christian faith, and destruction of the souls of men, ought duly to be restrained from such notorious impieties; it is therefore ordered and declared by the Court, that if any Christian within this jurisdiction shall go about to subvert and destroy the Christian faith and religion, by broaching and maintaining any damnable heresies; as denying the immortality of the soul, or resurrection of the body, or any sin to be repented of in the regenerate, or any evil done by the outward man to be accounted sin, or denying that Christ gave Himself a ransom for our sins, or shall affirm that we are not justified by His death and righteousness, but by the perfection of our own works, or shall deny the morality of the fourth commandment, or shall openly condemn or oppose the baptizing of infants, or shall purposely depart the congregation at the administration of that ordinance, or shall deny the ordinance of magistracy, or their lawful authority to make war, or to punish the outward breaches of the first table, or shall endeavor to seduce others to any of the errors and heresies mentioned; every such person continuing obstinate therein, after due means of conviction, shall be sentenced to banishment." (Quoted by Isaac Backus, History of New England, i. 321-322.)

nant. While the banishment of Roger Williams helped to bring him forward as an apostle of religious tolerance, he was not banished because he was an apostle of religious tolerance, or because of any specific religious tenet.[1] His impracticable individualism, leading him into opposition to State and Church, until his party was reduced well-nigh to his single self, sent him into exile. Immediately after his arrival (1631) he created a prejudice by refusing to join with the congregation at Boston, because they would not make public profession of repentance for having communed with the Church of England while they were in that country. Later he wrote against the Massachusetts patent, challenging the right of the colonists to the land under the King's grant, since the King had transcended his just prerogatives in making the grant. He called in question also the act of the colony in requiring an oath from residents, maintaining that the exacting of an oath from an unregenerate person involves the sin of using God's name in vain. Finally, taking offence because the General Court — in order to punish the Salem church, over which he presided, for adhering to him while under censure — denied a request of the town for a piece of land, he exhorted his church to withdraw from communion with the churches of the Bay, and declared that he would not commune with it unless his request was complied with. Soon after this he was sentenced,

[1] Among his special theses while in Massachusetts, we have not seen any which involved the question of tolerance, unless it was this, namely, that the magistrate ought not to punish transgressions of the first table of the decalogue. But this was only one of several points which provoked censure, and aside from it the General Court had, in its view, adequate cause for sentence of banishment.

on the ground of the aforesaid acts to depart out of the colony (1635).

The singularity of Williams which occasioned his exile seems not to have been immediately eliminated by that ordeal. At Providence, having concluded that he ought to be a Baptist, he procured immersion from one of his companions, to whom, as also to a few others, he then imparted the rite; thus laying the foundation of the first Baptist church in America. But in a few months he became convinced of the nullity of his baptism, and doubting about any known church having the true apostolic succession, concluded thereafter to be a Christian entirely on his own account.[1]

Thus far we have a record of eccentricity. But in Roger Williams there was something much better than mere eccentricity. With all his disputatiousness he bore a large and generous heart. He harbored no bitterness against Massachusetts on account of his banishment. For forty years thereafter, as Hutchinson remarks, he was repeatedly employed in acts of kindness and benevolence toward the colony which ejected him. This was his only revenge, except the master strokes which he dealt against religious persecution in his writings. No later writer has transcended his position on the subject of tolerance, for he reached here the very acme of radicalism. In his treatise entitled "The Bloody Tenet of Persecution for Cause of Conscience" he lays down this sweeping proposition: "It is the will and command of God that, since the coming of His Son the Lord Jesus, a permission of the most Pa-

[1] See Winthrop, History of New England, vol. i; H. M. Dexter, As to Roger Williams; Palfrey, History of New England, vol. i. chap. x.

ganish, Jewish, Turkish, or anti-Christian consciences and worships be granted to all men in all nations and countries; and they are only to be fought against with that sword which is only, in soul matters, able to conquer: to wit, the sword of God's spirit, the Word of God." To the defence of this and like theses he brought a spice of genius as well as a mighty earnestness. Accordingly, John Cotton, who attempted to wash the "bloody tenet," had a very indifferent success in the face of Williams' arguments. As the Boston preacher was not willing openly to concede that force has any place in dealing with men's religious convictions, he resorted to that muffled plea for intolerance toward heresy which may be discerned in the Westminster Confession. While allowing that conscience is to be respected, he maintained that in fundamentals God's Word is so clear that the errorist in this field must be made to see the truth after faithful admonition. Consequently, if he still persists in asserting errors, he acts against his own conscience, and in undergoing punishment he suffers, not for the sake of conscience, but as a violator of conscience. If John Cotton had stood alone in this representation, it would be counted a strange thing that he should have fancied that the admonition of one man or one party must of necessity conquer the intellect of another man or another party.

Close upon the banishment of Roger Williams followed the episode which passes in history as the "Antinomian Controversy." It was a dispute threatening to be more serious in its consequences than the foregoing, since it divided the most prominent men in the

colony and roused intense animosities. On the one side were the talented woman Mrs. Ann Hutchinson, her brother-in-law Wheelwright, almost the entire church in Boston, together with its eminent preacher, John Cotton. This party was also supported by the young Henry Vane, who served a term as governor, but left the country shortly before the issue of the strife. On the other side were Winthrop, the minister Wilson, and the general body of clergy and people outside of Boston. This party remained uncompromising in its opposition to the tenets of Mrs. Hutchinson. As for John Cotton, after taking the part of a moderate adherent of the Hutchinson party, he finally receded, alleging that the partisans of that side had deceived him by presenting the fairer aspects of their teaching and concealing its more radical phases.

The dogmatic ground of the controversy is thus given by Winthrop, in his first reference to the subject: "One Mrs. Hutchinson, a member of the church of Boston, a woman of ready wit and bold spirit, brought over with her two dangerous errors: first, that the person of the Holy Ghost dwells in a justified person; second, that no sanctification can help to evidence to us our justification."[1] Of these two propositions the second commanded the chief attention, and may be styled the core of the dispute. In the view of its advocates, the one evidence of justification is an immediate divine assurance, the testimony of the Holy Spirit to the believing heart. He who combines with this any reference to gracious dispositions or works falls below the evangelical stand-point, and descends to the plane of legality.

[1] History of New England, i. 239 (ed. 1853).

The theory involved a one-sided subjectivity. By the small stress that it placed upon the ethical test which is afforded in dispositions and works, it gave too free a scope to personal fancies and impressions. It was not out of accord with her principal doctrine that Mrs. Hutchinson should claim to have been the recipient of special revelations. But these implications were not the sole ground of complaint. The more forward among the Boston enthusiasts stigmatized their opponents as legalists, and discriminated against the ministers of that party as preaching a covenant of works. Mrs. Hutchinson herself had the uncharitable boldness to leave the church when Wilson rose to preach.

Here surely was a disagreeable and alarming state of affairs. Superior discretion and charity might have overcome the difficulties. But there was little of the latter, and no excess of the former. The rude expedient of force was therefore invoked. Soon after the restoration of Winthrop to the office of governor in place of Vane, the prosecution of the disturbing faction was urged forward with vigor, and in part with harshness and arbitrariness. Wheelwright, Mrs. Hutchinson, and Aspinwall were banished (1637), and a considerable number of their party were subjected to a minor punishment.

Less than a decade after the Antinomian spectre had been vanquished, the Massachusetts Puritans felt that they were confronted by another evil shape. The General Court, in 1644, after characterizing the Anabaptists as the incendiaries of commonwealths and the troublers of churches in all places which they had invaded, proceeded to denounce the penalty of banishment against

any person who should openly oppose infant baptism or seduce others to disapprove of the rite.

A rhetorical element may be discerned in the language of the Court. It is hardly probable that the Massachusetts legislators were pervaded by quite so great a horror of Anabaptist heresy as the preamble of their act would indicate. Cotton Mather says that among the planters of New England there were some from the beginning who held in a quiet way the Anabaptist theory.[1] No less a person than Henry Dunster, president of Harvard (1640–1654), did not believe in the propriety of infant baptism, and he might have retained his position in spite of his known views, had he not made it a matter of conscience to give public expression to his scruples. His successor, Charles Chauncy, so far espoused Baptist teaching as to regard immersion the only proper form, though he did not challenge infant baptism. It is to be concluded, therefore, that, unless there was an unusual degree of panic in 1644, the law-makers of that date could not have felt that there was any serious danger of a Münster tragedy being enacted in their midst. Nevertheless they may be credited with a real dread of the intrusion of Anabaptist, or — as we may properly say in this connection — Baptist teaching.

In 1651 a practical token of resentment against Baptist innovators was given through the arrest and fining of Clarke, Crandall, and Holmes, who took occasion to prophesy in Massachusetts, while on a visit there from Rhode Island. Of the three, Holmes, as he would not pay the fine or accept money for its payment, was sub-

[1] Magnalia, ii. 459.

jected to flogging. Sympathy with these sufferers has been abridged on the part of some writers, in consequence of the suspicion that they came on purpose to provide a case of persecution which might be of service in a special exigency of Rhode Island politics.[1] Naturally this interpretation of the subject is opposed by Baptist writers, and in truth the grounds alleged for it are rather plausible than conclusive. Some fourteen or fifteen years after the arrest of Clarke and his companions a Baptist congregation which had been gathered at Charlestown was molested, and some of its members were temporarily imprisoned. In 1680 a Boston society was inhibited from meeting in the house of worship which they had constructed, until the authorities should grant license. But meanwhile the party cherishing a tolerant regard for the Baptists, which had existed from the first, increased in numbers. A significant token of progress toward a better feeling was given in 1718, when Increase Mather, and his son Cotton Mather, who held a leading place among the Massachusetts clergy, consented to take part in the installation of a Baptist pastor. Still the old Congregational order held legally a preferred place, and the endeavor to guard its privileges caused still some local inconvenience to Baptists as well as to other classes of Gentiles.[2]

That persecution in Massachusetts should have reached its acme in relation to the Quakers is ex-

[1] H. M. Dexter, As to Roger Williams, pp. 119, 128; Palfrey, History of New England, ii 350.

[2] It was not till 1833 that discrimination in favor of the "Standing Order" was effaced from the laws of Massachusetts.

plained by two facts. In the first place they bore an evil name. They were regarded in England, at the middle of the seventeenth century, as wild and fanatical disturbers. Lovers of ecclesiastical order looked upon them very much as lovers of civil order now regard the most boisterous and intemperate anarchists, only in many cases with a greater apprehension of mischief. In the second place, they were the most resolute and stubborn witnesses for what they regarded as the truth. The fact that they were not wanted in a particular place, they interpreted as meaning that they were needed there; and the less they were wanted, the greater they felt was the need of their presence, that a proper testimony might be raised against sin. Massachusetts, therefore, in attempting to bar them out, invited them to press in at any cost.

The first instalment of the Quaker witnesses arrived in 1656, in the persons of two women, less than a month after the General Court had announced as one purpose of the appointed fast day, "to seek the face of God in behalf of our native country in reference to the abounding errors, especially those of Ranters, Quakers, etc." With all possible speed these forerunners were sent away. Laws were then passed for the imprisonment and bodily chastisement of any Quakers who should enter the jurisdiction, for the fining of shipmasters who should bring them in, as also of those who should circulate any of their books or defend their opinions. As the dreaded visitors were not kept out by these means, severer measures were adopted, it being ordered that any Quaker who should presume to come into the jurisdiction after having been punished should suffer

the loss of an ear for the first offence; for a second, the loss of the other; and for a third, have the tongue bored through with a hot iron. Finally, in 1658 the acme of legal severity was reached in the enactment that Quakers who should return after being twice banished, should be liable to the death sentence. This law, it should be observed in justice, was not popular. It was passed with difficulty, and indeed was rejected by the house of deputies when first presented. Those who voted for it did not do so as coveting the actual infliction of the extreme penalty. No one wanted the blood of the Quakers. The law was meant to serve *in terrorem*, and there was probably no serious apprehension that it would be dared to the death. But this conclusion was based on no proper measurement of the Quaker enthusiasm for testifying. Rather than yield the field to such a statute, there were those in the sect who would not accept deliverance. The result was that four Quakers were hanged (1659, 1660). Others made themselves liable to the same punishment. But popular sentiment revolted against further sacrifice, and the magistrates were obliged to fall back upon a less stringent policy. During the few subsequent years that the persecution continued, whipping at the cart's tail was the maximum infliction.

It has sometimes been supposed that the efficient cause of the lessened severity toward the Quakers was the order of Charles II. that those under arrest should be sent to England for their trial. But nearly a year before the promulgation of the royal order there had been a general jail delivery, by which thirty-one Quakers, including three under death sentence had

been set free, on condition of departing from the colony. Causes within the community, therefore, rather than royal interference, seem mainly to have wrought the change. It is to be observed also that the King's patronage of the Quakers was of a very limited kind, his first communication being pretty thoroughly offset by the second. In 1662, responding to representations from Massachusetts, he wrote: "We cannot be understood hereby to direct or wish that any indulgence should be granted to those persons commonly called Quakers, whose principles being inconsistent with any kind of government, we have found it necessary, by the advice of our parliament here, to make sharp laws against them, and are well contented that you do the like there." From first to last the *sharp laws* of England, if they did not directly enjoin capital inflictions, were instrumental in destroying scores of Quakers (through the miseries of imprisonment) where Massachusetts sent one to the scaffold.

This completes the record of intolerance, so far as conspicuous instances are concerned. The tragedy which was enacted at Salem Village in 1692 falls rather under the category of superstitious panic than of religious persecution. It was a piece of the most wretched and monstrous foolery which has darkened the annals of Christian nations, — a very small piece when compared with the kindred triumphs of the witchcraft delusion in the European countries, but relatively large in the history of the English colonies. The proximate occasion of the epidemic of terror and outrage seems to have been nothing more serious than a distempered search for diversion, on the part of a

group of girls, who for a number of weeks employed their evenings in dabbling with fortune-telling and magic. In virtue of their practice they became adepts in certain strange performances. As these came to the notice of their elders, instead of chastising them into sobriety, as was becoming, they helped to turn their heads and the heads of the community by declaring them bewitched. Urged to name those who used the power of the devil upon them and afflicted them with spectral appearances, they accused two or three. These accusations led to others. In all cases the charges were confirmed by the astounding experiences which the bewitched, probably blending art and distraction together, exhibited in the presence of the judges. For those once accused there was absolutely no means of escape. The chief justice having laid down the principle that the devil could not simulate the form of an innocent person, the testimony of those playing the rôle of the bewitched that they were tormented by the spectre of a certain person at once involved the conclusion that that person was in league with the Evil One, a veritable witch. To be cited was the same as to be found guilty; and, as the matter was conducted, a condemned person could escape the halter only by acknowledging the truth of the terrible charge. Accordingly the bravest and most steadfast in their integrity were just the ones to undergo the extreme penalty. Some of these nobly invited their fate by venturing to testify against the craze. Under the conditions this act was the next thing to a death-warrant, since it was almost certain to expose them to accusation. Twenty were executed. The company of the accused probably amounted

to no less than ten times that number; and there is no telling what aggregate would have been reached, had not the gang of accusers finally passed the bounds of public credulity by assailing persons whom, in consideration of their rank and reputation, very few were willing to account guilty. In this way the spell was broken. Infatuation was succeeded quite generally by a sickening sense of a terrible mistake. A deadly superstition had well-nigh destroyed itself by its own excesses.[1]

A supplementary picture belongs with that which has been presented in the last few pages. If Puritan New England earned the charge of a certain rigor and intolerance, it should also be credited with having provided an antidote to its own fault. Its intolerance was not that of an inert community hating everything interfering with its slumbrous ease. It was rather the intolerance of a community energetically striving after an ideal, and resentful toward objects which seemed to obstruct the way. Mental sloth was no part of the scheme of the New England Puritans. They fostered education as a chief foundation of public prosperity, and gave no slight emphasis to the truth that religion is essentially a relation between the individual and God. They thus provided for an intellectual progress which could not be hemmed in by tradition, for free thought, for manly independence, for the love and the faculty of a generous liberty. From no other field of equal extent has there come a larger body of stanch advocates of the essential rights of men.

As we pass from the seventeenth century we open a new chapter in the ecclesiastical history of New Eng-

[1] See Charles W. Upham, Salem Witchcraft, 1867.

land. The strained endeavor after an austere ideal is not so characteristic a feature as formerly. Through the enlarged doorway provided by the half-way covenant many had found an entrance into the churches who were not disposed to make religion the chief concern of life. The inroads of a contagious worldliness and spiritual sloth became more and more apparent. Doubtless the religious state of the Puritan colonies was not worse than that of other portions of the English-speaking world in that era. On the contrary, it was better. No such leaden sky hung over their spiritual landscape as darkened the face of England in the first half of the eighteenth century. Neither the infidelity of the higher ranks in the mother country nor the brutal insensibility of a large section of the lower classes found any conspicuous counterpart in New England. Nevertheless, religion had assumed here too much the cast of an inefficient respectability, and the gospel, as a transforming power over heart and life, was not holding its own against the world. The small pains taken to exclude from the ranks of the ministry those who did not give evidence of conversion, or a vital sense of divine things, tended to increase and to prolong religious dulness.[1]

[1] Whitefield and his American coadjutor, Gilbert Tennent, were very pronounced in their animadversions upon the prevalence of unconverted ministers. A well-informed writer remarks: "The number of unconverted ministers was probably fewer than these men supposed, especially in New England. Still it is useless to deny their existence. When the colleges received young men without even the appearance of piety to prepare for the ministry; when, if graduates were found to possess competent knowledge, and were neither heretical nor scandalous, their piety was taken for granted, and they were ordained of course; when the doctrine that unconverted ministers, though orthodox in doctrine

A corrective, however, was provided in the third generation from the introduction of the half-way covenant. By a remarkable awakening a new current was brought into the spiritual atmosphere. The revival began at Northampton, under the labors of Jonathan Edwards, near the end of the year 1734. For a considerable interval the movement progressed amid tokens of deep interest, and radical transformations. To use the language of Edwards: "Souls did, as it were, come by flocks to Jesus Christ. From day to day, for many months together, might be seen evident instances of sinners brought out of darkness into marvellous light. . . . There were remarkable tokens of God's presence in almost every house. It was a time of joy in families on account of salvation being brought unto them; parents rejoicing over their children as new born, and husbands over their wives, and wives over their husbands. The goings of God were then seen in His sanctuary. God's day was a delight, and His tabernacles were amiable. Our public assemblies were then beautiful; the congregation was alive in God's service, every one earnestly intent on the public worship, every hearer eager to drink in the words of the minister as they came from his mouth; the assembly in general were, from time to time, in tears while the Word was preached,— some weeping with sorrow and distress, others with joy and love, others with pity and concern for the souls of their neighbors." [1]

and regular in their lives, were 'the bane of the church,' gave offence, we may be sure that unconverted ministers existed." (Joseph Tracy, The Great Awakening, p. 393.)

[1] A Faithful Narrative of the Surprising Work of God, Works, i. 348 (ed. 1840).

The revival extended to South Hadley, Northfield, Coventry, Windsor, Stratford, and many other towns within or upon the borders of the Connecticut valley.

While this work was still fresh in the memory of the people it was followed and overlapped by another, of wider compass. The marvellous preaching of Whitefield gave here the initial impetus. Landing at Newport in September, 1740, the restless evangelist in the space of a few weeks had journeyed through the most populous towns and caused his voice to be heard by no small proportion of the inhabitants of New England. His audience was often composed of many thousands. At his farewell sermon on Boston common, if the report of an eye-witness may be trusted, not less than twenty-three thousand were present. The same correspondent adds: "Such a power and presence of God with a preacher, and in religious assemblies, I never saw before, and am ready to fear I shall never see again. The prejudices of many are quite conquered, and the expectations of others vastly outdone, as they freely own. A considerable number are awakened, and many Christians seem to be greatly quickened. In this town whoever goes to lessen Mr. Whitefield's reputation is in danger of losing his own." As might be judged from this testimony, Whitefield received a cordial welcome at his first visit, and was but little troubled by the voice of the critic. On his own part, he seems to have gained a favorable impression of the country. We find him noting the absence of scoffing, and the seemliness of the outward behavior with which he was met. As he was leaving the region he rendered this general estimate: "I have now had an opportunity of

seeing the greatest and most populous part of New England. On many accounts, it certainly exceeds all other provinces of America; and for the establishment of religion, perhaps all other parts of the world." [1]

Notwithstanding the enthusiasm with which Whitefield was received, there was a latent opposition to his work. To the sticklers for ecclesiastical order the very notion of an itinerant evangelism was obnoxious. It seemed to them a disrupting agency, a menace of schism and sectarianism. The methods of Whitefield were essentially distasteful to them. And this was not all. It was a special infirmity of the devoted evangelist that he was given to a somewhat headlong censorship. He atoned for his fault, indeed, by a very frank and humble retractation when convinced of being in the wrong. Still his sharp strictures left their wound. We have therefore an explanation of the rise of an opposition party, a party which criticised the revival in general, and Whitefield in particular. During his second visit (1744–45), he had occasion to notice that there were open antagonists in the field.[2] This division in the ranks, however, did not prevent the revival from extending to remarkable limits. It left an impress upon a hundred and fifty towns, and brought into the churches, within the space of a few years, from twenty-five to fifty thousand converts, besides raising many already in the churches from the formalities to the life of religion.

[1] Quoted by Tyerman, Life of Whitefield, i. 430.

[2] The faculties of Harvard and Yale thought it incumbent on themselves to make their protest against the tactics of Whitefield. One of the most determined and able among the leaders of the opposition was the Boston minister, Charles Chauncy.

It was not without a durable significance that the man of largest intellectual gift in New England was a prominent agent in the beginning of the revival, and its champion throughout. This unique fact tended to secure a right of way to earnest heart piety, to reduce ecclesiastical order to the rank of a subordinate interest, to make the idea of an unconverted ministry intolerable, and to place such an emphasis upon the requirement of conversion in the members as to banish the half-way covenant. The revival by itself would doubtless have worked toward these results. But the fact that the man of highest reputation as a theological thinker threw the weight of his arguments and influence on the side of such ends was obviously a very considerable contribution to their realization. Jonathan Edwards must be ranked among those who wrought efficiently toward the type of religion and religious method which is largely prevalent in the evangelical communions of this country.

In our view this aspect in the work of Edwards is not less important than any other. His service to religion takes precedence of his service to theology. In the latter field he showed, it must be allowed, uncommon subtlety and metaphysical ability. But he was bound by his presuppositions. His thorough committal to a scheme of absolute sovereignty and predestination forced him into one-sided results. He was led thereby to involve the human will in an inextricable chain of necessity, and could find no place for responsibility except by arbitrarily replacing the natural sense of the term with another meaning. In his endeavor to make the race sharers in the guilt of Adam he depleted the

notion of moral personality, and sustained a theory which might properly be regarded as an aggravation of the antique subordination of the individual to the mass. Views akin to these had already been advocated vastly beyond their merits, and it was no salutary vocation that Edwards fulfilled in giving them his support. There was, however, even in his theological activity a compensating element. His freshness and vigor gave a powerful stimulus to thought. An intellectual movement was started which could not be inclosed by traditional lines. While some of his successors, notably Samuel Hopkins and Nathaniel Emmons, brought out as ultra statements on the all-dominating sovereignty of God as were ever written, a tendency toward more moderate views also made its appearance, insomuch that the later New England theology, in many of its representatives, has made distinct approaches to evangelical Arminianism. External influences may indeed be credited in part with this result, but it is reasonable to regard it also as due in part to an interior development. Still, while giving place to this ameliorating consideration, it is with a certain complacency that we leave the theologian to view the saint, the champion of dogmas to regard the advocate of the interior life of communion with God. A serene region presents itself here, upon which the awful shadow of the reverse side of predestination does not appear to have cast either chill or gloom.

In religious sensibility, or the element of deep and fervent emotion, Jonathan Edwards ranks with the Wesleys and the foremost in the list of the mystics. Those who think of him simply as a logician see the

prosaic, and overlook the poetic, side of the man. "Besides his logic," it has been well said, "there was his strong and realizing faith. God, heaven, hell, the sinfulness of sin, the beauty of holiness, the glory of Christ, and the claims of the gospel were as substantial realities to his mind and heart as the valley of the Connecticut or the mountains of Berkshire."[1] At times he was transported into a species of ecstasy by his contemplation of divine verities. In his personal narrative we find testimonies like these: "Sometimes, only mentioning a single word caused my heart to burn within me, or only seeing the name of Christ, or the name of some attribute of God. . . . The sweetest joys and delights I have experienced have not been those that have arisen from a hope of my own good estate, but in a direct view of the glorious things of the gospel. When I enjoy this sweetness it seems to carry me above thoughts of my own estate; it seems at such times a loss that I cannot bear, to take off my eye from the glorious, pleasant object I behold without me, to turn my eye in upon myself, and my own good estate. . . . Once, as I rode out into the woods for my health, in 1737, having alighted from my horse in a retired place, as my manner commonly has been, to walk for divine contemplation and prayer, I had a view that for me was extraordinary, of the glory of the Son of God, as mediator between God and man, and His wonderful, great, full, pure, and sweet grace and love, and meek and gentle condescension. This grace, that appeared so calm and sweet, appeared also great above the heavens. The person of Christ appeared ineffably ex-

[1] Tracy, The Great Awakening, p. 214.

cellent, with an excellency great enough to swallow up all thought and conception, — which continued, as near as I can judge, about an hour; which kept me the greater part of the time in a flood of tears and weeping aloud. I felt an ardency of soul to be, what I know not otherwise how to express, emptied and annihilated; to lie in the dust, and to be full of Christ alone; to love Him with a holy and pure love; to trust in Him; to live upon Him; to serve and follow Him; and to be perfectly sanctified and made pure, with a divine and heavenly purity. I have several other times had views very much of the same nature, and which have had the same effects."

In writing upon the "Religious Affections," therefore, Edwards was dealing with a congenial theme. As might be expected, he strongly asserts in this able treatise the high worth of the affections in the sphere of religion. "It is evident," he says, "that religion consists so much in the affections as that without holy affection there is no true religion. No light in the understanding is good which does not produce holy affection in the heart; no habit or principle in the heart is good which has no such exercise; and no external fruit is good which does not proceed from such exercises. . . . Where there is a kind of light without heat, a head stored with notions and speculations with a cold and unaffected heart, there can be nothing divine in that light; that knowledge is no true spiritual knowledge of divine things. If the great things of religion are rightly understood they will affect the heart. . . . The manner of slighting all religious affections is the way exceedingly to harden the hearts of men, to en-

courage them in their stupidity and senselessness, to keep them in a state of spiritual death as long as they live."

While thus emphasizing emotion as a necessary constituent of genuine religion, Edwards seeks to guard against a distempered subjectivity. All impressions which have not an immediate ethical significance, which are not inseparably connected with a positive principle of holiness and spirituality, he reckons of very small account. So far does he disparage mere impressions or inward suggestions, as compared with a spiritual disposition, that he declines to make the former any factor in the assurance of the believer. Not a sentence in the understanding, but the birth of a gracious temper in the heart, or the outflow of the heart in filial trust and love, attests acceptance with God. "The witness of the Spirit of which the apostle speaks," he says, "is far from being any whisper, or immediate suggestion; but is that gracious, holy effect of the Spirit of God in the hearts of the saints, the disposition and temper of children, appearing in sweet, child-like love to God, which casts out fear. . . . The strong and lively exercises of evangelical, humble love to God give clear evidence of the soul's relation to God as His child; which very greatly and directly satisfies the soul. . . . Love, the bond of union, is seen intuitively; the saint sees and feels plainly the union between his soul and God." In addition to this stress upon a dominant ethical temper, Edwards provides a safeguard against subjective vagaries in the way in which he links religious emotions with the understanding. He finds a principal fountain of these emotions

in the contemplation of the beauty and majesty of divine verities. This is their proper objective ground, as a divinely wrought inward sensibility is their subjective spring.

In the mind of Edwards, ecclesiasticism was at a minimum. God was to him all in all. Piety meant the special presence and agency of God in the soul. Whatever place he may have given to the legal conception of God's relation to men in one part of his system, when his thought was directed to religious experience he dwelt emphatically upon the divine immanence and indwelling. Herein he furnished a bond of fellowship with eminent minds in succeeding times, who have been far from accepting some of the sombre phases of his teaching.

We have passed over the outward life of this most celebrated of the colonial divines. It makes, in fact, but a brief story. He was born in 1703, entered Yale College at thirteen, served there as tutor for two years (1724–1726), and was settled over the church at Northampton in 1727. After his dismission from Northampton in 1750, occasioned by his insistance upon strict terms of communion, he served as missionary in Stockbridge, preaching both to the Indians and the white congregation in that town. His death occurred in 1758, very soon after he had entered upon the presidency of Princeton College.

The wife of Edwards was his equal in religious sensibility and devotion. It was therefore with great fitness that he dictated to her, from his death-bed in Princeton, this message: "Tell her that the uncommon union which has so long subsisted between us has been

of such a nature as I trust is spiritual, and therefore will continue forever."

VII. — PRESBYTERIANS, BAPTISTS, QUAKERS, METHODISTS, AND OTHER NON-ESTABLISHED COMMUNIONS.

A section of Presbyterian history, it must be allowed, came under the régime of an establishment. But it was only a small section, that which included the progress of the Dutch Reformed Church in New York for a little more than a generation before the English occupation. American Presbyterianism, as a whole, has not been the subject of specific State recognition and patronage. The heading, therefore, which has been given to this division of our subject involves only a moderate trespass against accuracy. In a general glance the religious bodies enumerated may be classified as non-established communions.

1. PRESBYTERIANS. — From continental Europe there were three considerable classes of immigrants who had been wonted to a Presbyterian polity. These were the Dutch, the German, and the French representatives of the Reformed Church, or that group of communions which took its pattern from Zurich and Geneva. A large proportion of the German Reformed came from the Palatinate on the Upper Rhine. These as well as the Dutch were sufficiently numerous and concentrated to maintain, with comparative ease, a distinct organization. The French Reformed, or Huguenots, on the other hand, in their scattered condition tended toward absorption in other religious bodies.[1]

[1] On the important contribution which this element made to the country, see the preceding volume, p. 513.

At the time of the surrender of New York to the English (1664), the ministers of the Dutch Reformed Church numbered seven. Though this was no large supply for ten thousand people gathered into a number of towns, it suffered a reduction, and for an interval the resident pastors were only three. In the later years of the century a valuable accession was received in Dominie Selyns. "He was the chief of the early ministers to enlarge the usefulness of the Church, and to secure for it a permanent and independent foundation. He was of a catholic spirit, when liberality was not so common, speaking kindly of other denominations and rejoicing in their success. His amiable character endeared him to all around him. He was on terms of friendship with the heads of government, and in correspondence with distinguished men in the neighboring colonies. He was also a poet, versifying in both Dutch and Latin." [1]

Somewhat of an era was marked by the arrival of Jacob Frelinghuysen in 1720. Imbued with the spirit of pietism, and an earnest foe of mere formality, he figured in some measure as a forerunner of the revival which was inaugurated under Edwards, Whitefield, and the Tennents. He gave also a fresh impulse to his communion in the enterprise of training young men for the ministry.

The headship of the Dutch Reformed Church in the colonial period was vested in the Classis of Amsterdam. This Classis took the responsibility of supplying ministers, and though it allowed ordinations occasion-

[1] E. T. Corwin, Manual of the Reformed Church in America, 3d ed., p. 16.

ally to take place in this country, it expected that this would occur only by special permission. Near the middle of the eighteenth century some of the ministers began to feel that a larger measure of self-government ought to be enjoyed by the churches on this side of the Atlantic. They were not fully reconciled to the idea that the Coetus which was organized in 1747 should have nothing more than an advisory function. As a minority were for leaving full control to the Classis, there was a division of sentiment. Another cause for partisan feeling also found entrance, inasmuch as the conservative wing favored taking an interest in King's College, while the advocates of a relative independence, believing that that institution would be thoroughly dominated by Episcopalian influence, concluded that they ought to provide for ministerial education in a seminary of their own. The result was a rupture. This continued till 1771, when the discreet mediation of the able minister John H. Livingston prepared a reunion. The plan of agreement which was adopted gave little less than complete self-government to the colonial Church. Twenty-one years later the consummating act was taken. The constitution adopted in 1792 placed the Dutch Reformed Church upon an independent basis.

The German Reformed Church had its largest growth in Pennsylvania. Like the Dutch it recognized the headship of the Classis of Amsterdam. This occurred with the consent and advice of the Church in the Palatinate, which was not in condition to render the needed assistance. From 1730 — or shortly after the labors

of Weiss and Boehm had gathered the first Reformed congregations in Pennsylvania — to 1792 a close relation was maintained with the Amsterdam Classis.

In its earlier years the progress of the German Reformed Church was much hindered by lack of ministerial supply, and of adequate organization. A partial remedy to these defects was provided by the zeal and industry of Michael Schlatter, who came in 1746, and for several years fulfilled the office of general superintendent. Larger results might have been attained by him, had not his attempt to found free schools with the aid of English and Scotch charity provoked a race prejudice which drove him in 1757 from his official oversight.

Among the young men who came over with Schlatter was William Otterbein. In 1775 Baltimore became the field of his labor. Broad in his sympathies, and laying the chief stress upon heart piety, he was quite ready to pass over denominational lines where favorable opportunities were presented for friendly co-operation in Christian work. Such features of Methodism as the class system and the revival meeting commanded his appreciation. He cherished a friendly regard for Asbury, and assisted at his ordination in 1784. Asbury, on his part, greatly admired the learning and piety of the stalwart German, and spoke of him as "the great and good Otterbein." As several of his countrymen, among whom Martin Boehm was perhaps the foremost, joined zealously in the pietistic enterprise, it grew to considerable dimensions. Many were enlisted who had no special connection with the German Reformed Church, and as that body was not inclined to

adopt the movement, it soon issued in a separate communion bearing the name of United Brethren in Christ. This result was not designed by Otterbein. He continued in fact to regard himself as still within the pale of the old communion. His relation to the German Reformed Church was quite analogous to that of Wesley with the Church of England.[1]

One having in mind the broad area of Presbyterianism in Scotland, England, and Ireland, in the middle portion of the seventeenth century would naturally expect to find distinct tokens of an overflow in the presence of a large Presbyterian body in America. Doubtless a considerable number of Presbyterians from the British Isles had entered the colonies at an early date; but they were not aggregated. They came to regions where a different element was dominant. We have therefore to pass across the border of the eighteenth century before we find the communion which bears distinctively the name of "Presbyterians." The first presbytery which was instituted, that of Philadelphia, dates from 1706. In a letter from this presbytery to that of Dublin, in 1710, the extent of Presbyterianism in America was described as follows: "In all Virginia we have one small congregation on Elizabeth River, and some few families favoring our way in Rappahannoc and York; in Maryland four, in Pennsylvania five, in the Jerseys two, which bounds, with some places in New York, make up all the bounds

[1] J. H. Dubbs, Historic Manual of the Reformed Church in the United States.

which we have any members from, and at present some of these are vacant."[1]

From this point a rapid growth ensued. In 1716 the single presbytery had become a synod, with three subordinate meetings or presbyteries. Soon after the middle of the century the Presbyterians had passed all rivals in the three States, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York. When the General Assembly was organized in 1788, the seventeen presbyteries, ranging from New York to the Carolinas, included four hundred and nineteen churches.[2]

As respects theological teachings, the Presbyterian body in America remained sufficiently homogeneous throughout the colonial period. There was no such drift here as that which carried away the Presbyterian Church in England, and moved also a section of the Irish body from the old moorings. Still the American Presbyterians had early an occasion to deal with a subject which was a source of disturbance and division to both their English and their Irish brethren. The agitation on the subject of subscription which convulsed the meeting at Salter's Hall in 1719 had its counterpart in this country. It was not indeed a very exact counterpart. The party of non-subscribers here were not so stiff in their opposition to the requirement of subscription as were their confrères in England. They differed also from the latter as not including in their ranks any who were properly amenable to the charge of laxity in their personal creed. Still the question of

[1] Quoted by Charles Hodge, Constitutional History of the Presbyterian Church in America, pt. i., pp. 65, 66.

[2] C. A. Briggs, American Presbyterianism.

subscription assumed at one time a rather serious import.

The initiative in the discussion was taken by the New Castle Presbytery. In 1724 this presbytery began to require candidates for the ministry to give a formal assent to the Westminster Confession. Not content with this advance towards stringency in their own practice, representative men of the presbytery began to press for synodal action, by which the whole body of ministers might be securely anchored to the great Calvinistic creed. Their overture was not acceptable to all the ministers. A minority at least were opposed to the demand for subscription; and their cause received weight from the fact that their leader was a man of eminent character and ability. He has been described indeed as "the ablest man in the American Presbyterian Church in the colonial period." [1] This was Jonathan Dickinson, a native of Massachusetts, and a graduate of Yale College. So far as his own belief was concerned, Dickinson was as well content, probably, as any of his brethren with the Westminster Confession. But he did not believe in binding upon men the shackles of any elaborate creed. To use his own words, he held that "a joint acknowledgment of our Lord Jesus Christ for our common head, of the sacred Scriptures for our common standard both in faith and practice, with a joint agreement in the same essential and necessary articles of Christianity, and the same methods of worship and discipline, are a sufficient

[1] Briggs, American Presbyterianism, p. 216. Compare E. H. Gillett, History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, i. 39, 40.

bond of union for the being or well-being of any Church under heaven."[1]

Had Dickinson been a man of belligerent temper, a sharp antagonism might have resulted. But he was blessed with a superior degree of moderation and practical wisdom. Under his guidance the mooted question was brought to an adjustment which gave general if not universal, satisfaction for the time being. The expedient chosen was that of qualified subscription. In the so-called Adopting Act of 1729 the demands upon the subscriber were thus formulated: "Although the Synod do not claim or pretend to any authority of imposing our faith upon other men's consciences, but do profess our just dissatisfaction with, and abhorrence of, such impositions, and do utterly disclaim all legislative power and authority in the Church, being willing to receive one another as Christ has received us to the glory of God, and admit to fellowship in sacred ordinances all such as we have grounds to believe Christ will at last admit to the kingdom of heaven, yet we are undoubtedly obliged to take care that the faith once delivered to the saints be kept pure and uncorrupt among us, and so handed down to our posterity, — and do therefore agree that all the ministers of this Synod, or that shall hereafter be admitted into this Synod, shall declare their agreement in, and approbation of, the Confession of Faith, with the Larger and Shorter Catechisms of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, as being, in all the essential and necessary articles, good forms of sound words and systems of Christian doctrine, and do also adopt the said Confession and

[1] Hodge, Constitutional History, pt. i. p. 144.

Catechisms as the confession of our faith. And we do also agree that all the presbyteries within our bounds shall always take care not to admit any candidate of the ministry into the exercise of the sacred function but what declares his agreement in opinion with all the essential and necessary articles of said Confession, either by subscribing the said Confession of Faith and Catechisms, or by a verbal declaration of their assent thereto, as such minister or candidate shall think best. And in case any minister of this Synod, or any candidate for the ministry, shall have any scruple with respect to any article or articles of said Confession or Catechisms, he shall at the time of his making said declaration declare his sentiments to the Presbytery or Synod, who shall, notwithstanding, admit him to the exercise of the ministry within our bounds, and to ministerial communion, if the Synod or Presbytery shall judge such scruple or mistake to be only about articles not essential and necessary in doctrine, worship, or government. But if the Synod or Presbytery shall judge such ministers or candidates erroneous in essential and necessary articles of faith, the Synod or Presbytery shall declare them incapable of communion with them. And the Synod do solemnly agree that none of us will traduce or use any opprobrious terms of those that differ from us in these extra-essential and not necessary points of doctrine; but treat them with the same friendship, kindness, and brotherly love, as if they had not differed from us in such sentiments." [1]

[1] Briggs, pp. 217–220. Hodge and Gillett also give the text. In South Carolina the dispute over subscription was not so happily settled, and a division resulted.

Seven years later the Synod passed a declaration, which, if it did not directly limit the liberty which is naturally inferred from the language of the Adopting Act, is understood to have been in the interest of strict subscription. Perhaps the scanty attendance of the liberal party at the Synod of 1736 may have facilitated the passage of the declaration.

Before the question of subscription had passed out of consideration a cause of deeper agitation intervened. As early as 1730–32 the preaching of John Tennent at Freehold, New Jersey, had been attended with tokens of revival. Like effects followed the preaching of William Tennent in the succeeding years. Gilbert Tennent, a brother of the preceding, contributed still more to the awakening, being a man of stirring eloquence and aggressive force. Meanwhile the father of these preachers, through his school for ministerial training, known as the Log College, was preparing a number of young men to take the part of earnest evangelists. Accordingly, when Whitefield arrived, in 1739, he found that the spirit of revival had made much progress, and that a party was at hand which was ready to lend a zealous support to his type of religious enterprise.

But revival methods were not agreeable to all. A few probably were at so low a point in their own religious life that they felt a species of repulsion toward any manifestation of earnest religion. A larger number entertained an aversion for the disorders of the revival. They were sensitive to the violation of ecclesiastical order. They looked upon the entrance of itinerant preachers into fields already under pastoral

charge as a rude and unwarranted intrusion. The somewhat headlong censoriousness with which Gilbert Tennent and others commented on unconverted ministers provoked in them a greater or less resentment. Since those who felt thus were a considerable party, they took pains to raise some bars against their more ardent brethren. Measures were passed by the Synod (1737, 1738), which were designed to check the practice of itinerating, and to transfer the power of licensing ministers from the local authority, or Presbytery, to the central body. The covert aim of the last measure was understood by its opponents to be the exclusion of candidates who might serve as spirited and effective preachers, but perchance could not meet a severe technical requirement as respects scholastic attainments.

The advocates of the revival were not a little aggrieved by these acts, and showed a pronounced disinclination to acquiesce in them. In their view the paramount duty was to bring to all men the vital and saving message of the gospel. They considered the action of the Synod an unwarrantable attempt to bind the Word of the Lord. This feeling was especially rife in the Presbytery of New Brunswick, where the influence of the Tennents was paramount. In the matter of licensing candidates this Presbytery overrode the restriction imposed; and, as it would not render the desired satisfaction on this and other points, its delegation was denied a place in the Synod (1741). Had the ejection occurred by due process, the Synod would have had the advantage of legal right on its side. But that was not the fact; the New Brunswick presbyters were dismissed in an arbitrary fashion. Thus a schism

was precipitated, and "Old Side" and "New Side" became competing bodies. Many who were friendly at once to the revival and to good order considered that the New Brunswick Presbytery had been dealt with unwarrantably, and joined with it after failing to obtain an accommodation from the Synod. The result was that the Synod of New York, as a rival of that of Philadelphia, was constituted in 1745.

The schism continued till 1758. During the interval the Old Side remained comparatively stationary. The New Side, on the other hand, or the party of the revival, made large advances. One noteworthy trophy of its activity was a successful missionary project in Virginia. In laying the foundation of Presbyterianism in this province, a prominent part was taken by Samuel Davies, who ranks with Dickinson among the foremost of the Presbyterian divines of the colonial era. Another achievement was the founding of New Jersey College in 1747. Princeton became the seat of the college in 1756.

In arranging the terms of the reunion which was effected in 1758, it was necessary to recur to the subject of subscription. In the view of those who ought to be competent interpreters the solution arrived at was substantially a reaffirmation of the principle of the Adopting Act which had been passed in 1729.[1]

Alongside the main orb of American Presbyterianism there were a few of the lesser luminaries to which Scotch pertinacity, or conscientiousness, or both, had

[1] Briggs, pp. 319–321; Gillett, i. 78, 79. The latter writer says: "The *systematic* in contradistinction from the *ipsissima verba* subscription was re-established at the reunion in 1758."

given origin. Not far from the middle of the eighteenth century representatives of the Covenanters (or Reformed Presbyterian Church) and of the Associate Presbytery obtained definite organization. In 1782 a large part of the former body united with the latter, thus giving rise to the Associate Reformed Church.

2. THE BAPTISTS. — Reference was made in the preceding section to the first Baptists in Massachusetts and Rhode Island. Outside of these colonies the Baptist era dates from the closing part of the seventeenth century or the early part of the eighteenth. Before the close of the former century Baptist churches were organized in Maine, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina. It should be noted, however, that the congregation in Maine was soon dispersed, and that nearly a century elapsed before the work of organizing Baptist churches in that region was again undertaken. "In 1688 the Baptist denomination in North America comprised thirteen churches only. Seven were in Rhode Island, two in Massachusetts, one in South Carolina, two in Pennsylvania, and one in New Jersey."[1] In Connecticut, Virginia, and New York the Baptists acquired an organized existence in the first quarter of the eighteenth century. They had a church in North Carolina in 1727, in Maryland in 1742, in New Hampshire in 1750, or shortly thereafter; in Georgia in 1772. The middle and latter part of the century was a time of rapid growth in the country as a whole. "In 1740 the number of churches was thirty-seven, with less than three thousand members, but in 1790 there

[1] J. M. Cramp, Baptist History, p. 471.

were eight hundred and seventy-two churches, containing 64,975 members."[1]

The great revival which began in the fourth decade of the eighteenth century gave to the Baptists an impulse of far-reaching consequence. One of the immediate fruits of that revival in New England was a number of congregations which were led to take an independent position in relation to the "standing order," either because they considered the local pastor too intolerant of religious excitement, or wished for more stringent terms of fellowship than were maintained where the half-way covenant prevailed. Not a few of these congregations — mentioned as Separatists, and sometimes as New Lights — became associated with the Baptists.

From this source an effective evangelistic agency was provided for North Carolina and Virginia. In 1754 Shubal Stearns, who had become identified with the Separatists, proceeded with some members of his congregation to Virginia. The next year he passed across the border into North Carolina, where his labors resulted in gathering a very flourishing congregation. Soon Stearns and others who had imbibed a kindred zeal began to preach in Virginia after the manner of itinerant evangelists. As indicated above, they were not the first representatives of Baptist principles in Virginia. A company of Baptists from England had been organized as a church in the southern part of the province in 1714, and in 1743 immigrants from Maryland had established a congregation in the northern part, the nucleus of the Regular Baptists in that section of the country. However, before the arrival of the

[1] Cramp, p. 527.

new-comers, who were called Separate Baptists, no great progress had been made. The revival methods which they employed with marked earnestness proved to be very efficacious in attracting attention and winning converts. At the same time they were equally efficacious in provoking the animosity of the clergy and the magistrates belonging to the Establishment. In the course of the persecution about thirty ministers, besides many subordinate laborers, were imprisoned, some of them more than once. Opposition in this form, however, rather helped than hindered success. Before the end of the century Virginia had become a stronghold of the Baptists. In 1793 the denomination in the State was able to boast of 227 churches, 272 ministers, and 22,793 communicants, or nearly one third of the whole number of Baptists to be found at that time within the limits of the United States.[1] Six years previously the different branches — Separates, Regulars, and Independents — had agreed to be known under the common title of United Baptist Churches of Christ in Virginia.

In theology the tendency among American Baptists was to enthrone Calvin. Nevertheless Arminianism had its representatives. It is understood that this was the creed of the first Baptists who settled in the southern part of Virginia, though communication with others eventually corrupted, or perfected, their faith into Calvinism.[2] Arminian Baptists were found in Rhode Island and Connecticut, and in 1729 an Association of

[1] Thomas Armitage, History of the Baptists, p. 735.

[2] R. B. Semple, History of the Rise and Progress of the Baptists in Virginia, p. 348.

their churches was formed at Newport. Speaking of the time when the Warren Association was organized (1767), a Baptist writer says of the New England churches, "Some of them were frankly Arminian in doctrine."[1] Several of the leading preachers in Virginia espoused the Arminian position. In 1780 Benjamin Randall founded a denomination, the Free Will Baptists, which made the Arminian doctrines of grace a distinctive feature, as well as open communion.

Various eccentricities in usage and polity made their appearance. A number of these are summarized in the following appeal for charitable judgment: "If the churches composing the Sandy Creek Association in North Carolina were tenacious of the kiss of charity, the laying on of hands upon members, the appointment of elderesses, and such things; if a large Baptist body in Virginia was so mistaken as to choose in 1774 three of their number, and designate them 'apostles,' investing them with power of general superintendence; and if in some respects the fervency of New Light feelings got the better of discretion and decorum, we must bear in mind the peculiarities of the times."[2] To this enumeration should be added the eccentricity which is represented in the Seventh Day Baptists. In Rhode Island those who advocated the keeping of the seventh day were formed into a separate church in 1671. This was the beginning of the denomination in America.[3]

[1] Armitage, History of the Baptists, p. 717.

[2] Cramp, Baptist History, p. 545.

[3] Backus mentions William Hiscox and six others as primarily composing the church. Soon afterwards a family, or several families, by the name of Rogers, joined them; but these new members seem ere long to have fallen into an independent position, thus giving rise to a

An offshoot of the German Baptists, or Dunkers, who settled in Pennsylvania between 1719 and 1729, also maintained the obligation to sanctify the seventh day.

A considerable proportion of Baptist preachers in colonial times were men of but moderate education. The leaders of the denomination, however, were far from being indifferent to learning. In 1764 a memorial of their enlightened zeal was provided through the founding of Rhode Island College, known later as Brown University. A principal part in this enterprise was taken by James Manning and Morgan Edwards, who may be ranked, along with Isaac Backus and Hezekiah Smith, among the eminent representatives of the denomination in that period.

3. The Quakers or Friends. — The decade falling between 1656 and 1666 was the era of special persecution for the Quakers in America, as it was the era of their arrival in Massachusetts, New York, and Virginia. While the two latter colonies did not reach the full measure of severity which was exemplified in the first, they endeavored to shut out the restless evangelists by stringent laws, and left upon a number of them the marks of a sharp chastisement.

As has already been noticed, this kind of tuition was not at all effective in teaching the Quakers the art of keeping away. They pressed into nearly all the colonies at an early date. Soon after persecution had spent its fierceness, they were represented by some able missionaries who journeyed extensively along the Atlantic

party known as Rogerenes. With the keeping of the seventh day they combined Quaker phraseology and the renunciation of medicines. (History of New England, i. 324, 325, 381; ii. 11, 501.)

coast. Here belong in particular the names of John Burnyeat and William Edmundson, not to mention the eccentric founder himself, George Fox, who started upon a colonial tour in 1671.

Maryland was visited shortly after the first envoys of the Society had advertised their presence in America. In the population of the Carolinas the Quakers were an element from the first years of the settlements. John Archdale, one of the Proprietors, who became governor in 1695, was a member of the Society.

The special domain of the Quakers, however, was West Jersey and Pennsylvania. The former passed into the hands of Quaker proprietors in 1674, and the latter was colonized under the patronage of William Penn in 1682. In both territories the members of the Society formed a large proportion of the people for the space of a generation; but the rapid influx of immigrants of other persuasions left them probably in the minority as early as the death of Penn (1718). One element in the Pennsylvania community testifies that the missionary activity of the Society in continental Europe had not been wholly fruitless. "During 1686 many Friends from Germany and Holland arrived in the province. Most of the Germans settled at Germantown, about six miles from Philadelphia, where some of their countrymen had already located."[1]

In conformity with the fundamental principles of the Quakers, there was no preferred party in Pennsylvania as respects religion, but all stood on an equality before the law. The code which Penn prepared for the colony,

[1] James Bowden, History of the Society of Friends in America, ii. 33.

if not up to the radical position of Roger Williams, was still exceptionally tolerant. It used this language: "That all persons living in this province who confess and acknowledge the one Almighty and Eternal God to be the Creator, Upholder, and Ruler of the world, and that hold themselves obliged in conscience to live peaceably and justly in civil society, shall in no wise be molested or prejudiced for their religious persuasion or practice in matters of faith and worship; nor shall they be compelled at any time to frequent or maintain any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever."

The strong aversion of the Quakers to ecclesiasticism, carried to the point of repudiating a paid ministry, did not cause them wholly to neglect organization. They provided in fact a tolerably complete system of government through a hierarchy of assemblies. Above the individual congregation was the Monthly Meeting; above that, the Quarterly Meeting; highest of all, the Yearly Meeting. The lack of a meeting which should represent the whole Society was met in part by the deference paid to the parent Yearly Meeting at London, and also by a very general acknowledgment of a common set of principles. The first Yearly Meeting in America was organized in Rhode Island in 1661. A second was established at Burlington, New Jersey, twenty years later. In 1683 a Yearly Meeting was held at Philadelphia. According to an arrangement made in 1685, Philadelphia and Burlington were to be alternately the seat of the Yearly Meeting for Pennsylvania and the Jerseys.

The theological teaching of the Quakers continued

through the colonial period to correspond to the exposition which had been given by Robert Barclay. They believed in the Bible as the Word of the Lord, but gave the primacy to the Holy Spirit in His direct working upon the soul. They were in sympathy with the doctrine of the Trinity, though preferring to speak upon the subject in Biblical language rather than in that of the creeds. In their explanation of justification they slighted the judicial aspect, and laid the whole stress upon an inward birth or sanctification. The sacraments they regarded as savoring of an undue externalism. In accordance with their emphasis upon the inward working of the Spirit, and the independence of that working from all externals, they entertained a more generous hope respecting the salvation of the heathen than was common in that age.

It has been noticed on a previous page that the Memnonites agreed with the Quakers in their opposition to oaths and to war. Pennsylvania, therefore, naturally afforded them a congenial retreat. Some of them early responded to the invitation of William Penn to settle in that quarter.

4. Methodists. — The Wesleys at the time of their brief sojourn in Georgia, represented the High Church, ascetic, Oxford stage of their religious development. Methodism in its proper character they did not represent. Whitefield at his coming was possessed by the evangelical spirit of the great revival, and in this view may be regarded as a genuine exponent of Methodism. But Whitefield followed simply the vocation of an evangelist. He left others to gather up the fruits of his labors, and those labors inured mainly to the bene-

fit of the Calvinistic communions. Methodism in its Arminian phase, and as a distinctly organized movement, was due to agents who had received their religious impulse from a different source.

In the order of time these agents followed the apostle of Calvinistic Methodism. Whitefield was on the way to his last triumphant tour in America and to his grave in Newburyport, when the first missionaries sent out by John Wesley were crossing the Atlantic. The arrival of Richard Boardman and Joseph Pilmoor at Philadelphia, in October of the year 1769, preceded by only a few weeks the completion of Whitefield's final voyage.

While Boardman and Pilmoor were the first immediate representatives of Wesley and the English Conference in this country, the founding of Methodism here, as is well known, is not to be ascribed to them. They came in fact at the urgent call of an already existing Methodism. Several laborers preceded them, by at least a few years. In 1766 Philip Embury, belonging to a family which had emigrated from the Palatinate to Ireland, began to minister as a local preacher to a small congregation in New York City. The next year his efforts were seconded by Captain Webb, a military evangelist, who, as John Adams testifies, knew how to wield effectually the sword of the Spirit as well as to handle carnal weapons. Displaying in a new form the soldierly character which he had exhibited at Louisburg and Quebec, he not only inspirited the little band at New York, but helped also to carry the Methodist standard into New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware. About the same time that Embury commenced to preach

in New York, or shortly before, as some writers contend,[1] Robert Strawbridge, a native of Ireland, inaugurated a work that soon manifested its fruitfulness in the sending forth of a number of Methodist evangelists. Robert Williams also preceded the arrival of those who were directly commissioned for the American field, though only by a very brief interval. To him belongs the distinction of having founded Methodism in Virginia.

An appreciable impetus was given to Methodist evangelism by the arrival of Francis Asbury in 1771. So large was Wesley's confidence in the ability and devotion of this disciple that he appointed him the next year, though but twenty-seven years of age, to the oversight of the American societies. In 1773 he was relieved of this office by the arrival of Thomas Rankin; but in a few years he resumed the leadership which was to serve as a prominent factor in the ecclesiastical history of this country.

Before the close of the Revolutionary War, the societies in America were regarded as an adjunct of the Episcopal or Established Church. This was their theoretical position; but practically they held a very loose relation to the Establishment. Most of the Episcopal clergy had no sympathy with the Methodist preachers, and reckoned them antagonists rather than allies. One distinguished exception, nevertheless, may be noted. The Virginian clergyman, Devereux Jarratt, emulated the revival zeal of the Methodists, and gladly

[1] A sentence of Asbury can be quoted on the side of this conclusion. Speaking of Pipe-Creek, he says: "Here Mr Strawbridge formed the first society in Maryland — *and America.*" (Journal, April 30, 1801.)

employed their services in his neighborhood, at least for a time. "He was the first," says Asbury, "to receive our despised preachers, when, strangers and unfriended, he took them to his house, and had societies formed in his parish. Some of his people became travelling and local preachers amongst us."[1]

The dates given above may serve to indicate that at the time when American Methodism was planted, the storm-cloud of the Revolution was already ascending the horizon. So great a political crisis naturally was a source of no small embarrassment. The foremost of the Methodist preachers were fresh from England, acting under the orders of John Wesley, and uncertain of the length of their stay in the country. They had therefore but a moderate incentive to ally themselves with the cause of the colonies. Asbury, it is true, showed early an aptitude to become Americanized, and was not without sympathy with the struggle for independence. The majority of the Methodist laity shared in the patriotic ardor of their countrymen. But the English preachers in general, while they observed in most instances a prudent reserve, were not ready to renounce their relation with the mother country. Unavoidably their position exposed them to much suspicion, and this was increased by the imprudence of Wesley in publishing a tract against the political demands of the colonies (1775). Wesley, it is true, acted in a manner as the advocate of the colonies. Near the time that the tract was published, he sent a communication to the ministers of State (June, 1775), wherein he warned them that the attempt to settle American

[1] Journal, April 19, 1801.

affairs by coercion would probably end in failure. But very little, if any, account was made of this, and the item that was blazoned abroad was Wesley's disparagement of the colonial cause. The result could not be otherwise than unfavorable to the interests of Methodism in America. Asbury soon found himself deserted by all his English co-laborers, and for an interval was subject to some restraint. Advance was checked by these great difficulties. Nevertheless, there was not a complete standstill, and the Methodist societies at the end of the Revolutionary War were able to exhibit a considerable increase. The number of members in 1784 was 14,988. Of these the great majority were in the South. Only 1,607 were north of Mason and Dixon's line.

The independence of the country, while it did not necessarily separate the societies from Wesley's leadership, left them quite beyond the pale of the Church of England. It lay, to be sure, in their option to seek an association with the Episcopal churches which became organized into the Protestant Episcopal Church. But there was no adequate motive for overtures in that direction. They were practically aliens from the Episcopal body, and had no reason to think that union could be obtained, except upon obnoxious terms. Moreover, the national crisis had served to beget an inclination to independence. The retirement of the English laborers from the field had left the control to native Americans, who had no share in Wesley's attachment to the Establishment, and only a qualified attachment to his person. In 1779 the Conference held in Virginia virtually declared for an independent status by providing for the

administration of the sacraments in the societies. Earnest entreaty and the interests of unity caused indeed that this provision should be placed in abeyance for the time being. Still it was a clear token that the societies were advancing to an irrepressible demand for proper church organization. Wesley was therefore recognizing the inevitable when, in 1784, he sent over a scheme of government and the agents who should put it into execution. As noticed in another connection, these agents were Thomas Coke, Richard Whatcoat, and Thomas Vasey,— the first holding the rank of superintendent, and commissioned to ordain Asbury to the same; the others prepared to exercise the functions of elders.

In the explanatory letter which Wesley sent with his representatives, he used this language: "As our American brethren are now totally disentangled both from the State and the English hierarchy we dare not entangle them again either with the one or the other. They are now at full liberty simply to follow the Scriptures and the primitive Church. And we judge it best that they should stand fast in that liberty wherewith God has so strangely made them free." Evidently this language implies complete ecclesiastical independence. There is no hint of any sort of organic connection with any other religious communion. Wesley, if he knew how to use the English language, must have designed at that time full independence, not indeed of himself in his personal capacity, but of the Anglican and every other ecclesiastical organization.

The intent of Wesley has of course only a biographical significance. Whatever parts of his proposals were

accepted became of constitutional force, not because he had proposed them, but because they were accepted by the Methodist preachers in America acting as a legislative body. The Christmas Conference of 1784 was the primary source of constitutional authority. The members of this Conference, it is true, voted to regard themselves as still sons of Wesley, and to give heed to his commands. But this was a voluntary expression of courtesy and dutifulness. It was not regarded as a contract proper; and in fact the concession was withdrawn three years later, when there seemed to be some hazard of an inconvenient interference from abroad.

While an episcopal organization was undoubtedly contemplated, the highest officials were at first called simply superintendents, and the term "episcopal" was attached to the organization. "It was agreed," says Asbury, "to form ourselves into an episcopal church, and to have superintendents, elders, and deacons."[1] But in the course of a few years the episcopal title was carried over to the chief officers, — an eminently consistent procedure, inasmuch as the church was entitled to be called episcopal only because it had bishops. The change of name involved no change of conception; and continuously the conception was free from the infection of prelatical notions. Wesley, influenced doubtless by the complications of his position in England, was not pleased with the change of name. But the scheme which he had proposed really contemplated a more emphatic type of episcopal authority, a more autocratic

[1] Journal, Dec. 18, 1784.

relation of the superintendent to the preachers, than that which in fact was admitted. [1]

Some prominent features in the present constitution of the Methodist body were not considered in the General Conference of 1784. No specific mention was made of presiding elders, and the office was not instituted except in germ. It required, however, but a brief interval for its development. A number of the ministers were ordained elders; and naturally they were intrusted with a certain oversight of the junior ministers on a circuit, as well as with the administration of the sacraments. The number of elders being limited, there was a demand for them to administer the sacraments on more than one circuit. Accordingly, the whole field came to be divided into districts, and the function of the presiding elder was outlined with tolerable distinctness. The office was recognized by the General Conference of 1792. For a time there was no determinate scheme of Conferences. Definite boundaries were first assigned to the Annual Conferences in 1796, and the General Conference first took the character of a delegated body in 1812. A special anomaly in the early Methodist constitution was the lack of any provision for the co-operation of laymen with the ministers in the higher councils of the Church. While the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church included lay representatives, a Methodist Conference was a purely ministerial body. The arrangement, however, seems

[1] Thomas Ware testifies that one reason for cancelling, in 1787, the declaration of submission to Wesley was the evident preference of Wesley to have matters decided by the superintendents rather than by vote of Conference. (John Atkinson, Centennial History of American Methodism, p. 66.)

not to have provoked comment. Wesley's practice had not been such as naturally to bring the subject of lay representation into view.

The Conference of 1784 considered a project for denominational education. Three years later Cokesbury College was opened at Abingdon, Maryland. The building having been destroyed by fire in 1795, Baltimore was made the site of the college, where it was soon visited again with the fiery ordeal. Such a cumulation of misfortune could hardly fail to put a check for a season upon the enterprise of collegiate education.

From the time of its organization into a distinct communion, Methodism rapidly advanced. Its class system and its itinerancy gave it a special adaptation to pioneer work. The one feature enabled it easily to plant the nucleus of a church in the midst of a meagre settlement, and the other qualified it to reach with marked rapidity every quarter that was in need of gospel privileges. Within six years from the first General Conference it had more than trebled its numbers. In 1792 its membership was reckoned at 65,980. The O'Kelly schism,[1] which occurred in that year, checked progress for an interval, but a rapid increase was again manifest after a few years.

No small portion of this advance was due to Bishop Asbury. In mental fertility he was not the equal of John Wesley. But in devotion and industry he was not at all his inferior, and in faculty for administration

[1] The immediate cause of O'Kelly's disaffection was the rejection of his proposition to limit the appointing power of the bishop, by allowing a right of appeal to the Conference. The party of O'Kelly at first took the name of "Republican Methodists," later that of the "Christian Church."

he was scarcely second.[1] The American field he understood vastly better than did Wesley, and he managed its interests with almost uniform discretion. By example and by counsel, through a long period of years, he nurtured a truly militant spirit in the ranks of the Methodist ministers. Under his direction they were marshalled into effective co-operation. The impress of his hand may be seen more or less in the vigor and precision which have characterized the forward march of Methodism ever since his day.

Among the coadjutors of Asbury an eminent place belongs to Jesse Lee. Of good presence and gentlemanly bearing, an adept in repartee, dowered with thorough self-command and courage, sympathetic and persuasive in discourse, he was well qualified for the self-imposed task of planting Arminian Methodism in New England. Before his invasion, this reputed stronghold of Puritan orthodoxy had been avoided by the Methodist itinerants. Boardman had indeed made a brief visit to Boston in 1772. But no one followed up his effort, and all visible result had faded away. The regions beyond the borders of New England were sooner cultivated, a successful work having been undertaken in Nova Scotia by Freeborn Garrettson (1785–1787). Two years after the return of Garrettson, or in 1789, Lee began his evangelistic tour in New England. The next summer he introduced himself to Boston in the historic sermon on the common. In 1791 the first

[1] Coke wrote: "I exceedingly reverence Mr. Asbury; he has so much wisdom and consideration, so much meekness and love; and under all this, though hardly to be perceived, so much command and authority." (Journal, Nov. 14, 1784.)

house dedicated to Methodist worship in New England was built at Lynn. Lee was often reminded that he had left Southern hospitality behind, and moved some degrees toward the north pole. Still, he appreciated the good qualities of the people, contented himself with the reflection that he was better received than could have been expected, and pressed forward with a sunny pertinacity.

5. THE LUTHERANS. — The Swedes who began their settlement on the Delaware in 1637 were the first Lutherans in America who could boast of a complete church organization and house of worship. It is probable, however, that representatives of Lutheranism were found among the Dutch in New York prior to the planting of the Swedish colony. The Jesuit Jogues noticed their presence during his stay in the province (1642, 1643). But, while they were early on the ground, they were not in condition to make much advancement. The Dutch Reformed were of the opinion that the Augsburg Confession was not entitled to any hospitality in a territory which had been consecrated to the sacred theology of Dort. Scant privileges were therefore allowed to the Lutherans; and when their first pastor arrived, in 1657, he was ungraciously ordered back. This extreme of intolerance was indeed corrected some years later by the home authorities. Still it was not till after the English occupation that the Lutherans in New York obtained pastoral oversight.

A few years after the surrender of New York by the Dutch, a detachment of Lutherans proceeded to the Carolinas. Of their religious history in their southern abode next to nothing is known till the eighteenth cen-

tury. In the course of that century the Lutheran community in the Carolinas was augmented by emigrants from Germany and Switzerland.

The expatriation of the Salzburgers brought a considerable community of Lutherans to Georgia in the first years of its history. In 1741 they numbered not less than twelve hundred. Among all the immigrants professing the Lutheran faith none gave more careful heed to the claims of religion than this community.

A very large influx of German Lutherans, from Würtemberg, the Palatinate, Hesse-Darmstadt, and other German principalities, occurred in the first sixty years of the eighteenth century. The greater portion of them settled in Pennsylvania. Being generally very poor, and receiving no aid from the father-land, they were left for a time in strange destitution as regards religious ministrations, the number of pastors in the country being utterly inadequate to the demand. At length the cry of the more earnest for messengers of the gospel found a sympathetic response in Pietistic Halle. Heinrich Melchior Muhlenberg, who arrived from that institution in 1742, proved to be the forerunner of an efficient company of ministers from the same source.

In a few years the Lutheran interest presented a more organized and progressive aspect. The first Synod was constituted in 1748, with Lancaster and Philadelphia as the places of meeting. A second Synod was formed at Albany in 1786. The Revolutionary War intervened as a disturbing agency. Advance was also retarded by the ultra conservatism of a large party in maintaining the use of the German language for all church purposes. Still, assisted by a continuous stream of immigration,

the Lutheran Church was destined in the next century to exhibit a very large growth.[1]

6. Universalists. — Organized Universalism in this country is traced back to John Murray more than to any single individual beside. Murray, from being a Calvinistic Methodist, became a disciple of the London Universalist, James Relly. His arrival in America occurred in 1770. After a season of comparative reserve, during which he was known as a spirited Calvinistic preacher, he began an energetic propagandism of the doctrine of the final recovery of all moral beings.

Murray's teaching was not altogether a novelty in the colonies. Though there was no ecclesiastical body here that made it their shibboleth, restorationism had already a sporadic existence. The German Baptists in Pennsylvania were not averse to the doctrine, finding no doubt a recommendation for it in the fact that various of their kin among the Anabaptists on the Continent had been its advocates. Several Episcopalian ministers, in the middle and the latter part of the eighteenth century, as Richard Clarke in South Carolina, Robert Yancey in Virginia, and John Tyler in Connecticut, were more or less pronounced restorationists. A few of the Congregationalist ministers in New England were at the same time inclined to the restorationist creed. This was notably the case with Charles Chauncy, whose views first obtained definite expression before the public in works issued in 1782 and 1784, but had been held by him for a score of years or more.[2]

[1] See E. J. Wolf, The Lutherans in America.

[2] Jonathan Mayhew has sometimes been coupled with Chauncy as a believer in restorationism. But the passage which is cited as evidence, whatever ground it may afford for a suspicion, affords none for a posi-

Murray's conversion to a new faith did not eliminate the old Calvinistic leaven. In his doctrine of universal recovery he simply extended the conception of sovereign grace. All men, he conceived, are regarded by God as united to the atoning Saviour, so that His righteousness is made to cover their sins, and all are accounted heirs of eternal life. A large proportion of the first converts to Universalism were likewise of Calvinistic antecedents, and retained some traces of their former way of thinking. The Calvinistic bias, however, was only a transient phase. Probably the influence of Elhanan Winchester, who was hardly second to Murray as an active propagandist, had something to do with forwarding a change of sentiment. Winchester, it is true, had embraced high Calvinism before the writings of Siegvolck and Stonehouse had converted him to Universalism (1778–1781). But later he seems to have inclined to a creed essentially Arminian as respects divine sovereignty and grace.[1] Winchester came from the Baptists, as did also a considerable part of the ministers and membership of the Universalist body in its early years.

tive verdict. Among the points of certainty are these: Mayhew denied that the punishment which is to be visited upon the sinner in the future will be simply corrective, or designed for the good of its subject He applied the terms "eternal" and "everlasting" to this punishment, without taking pains to qualify their force. He did not hesitate to speak of "finally hardened" and "irreclaimable" transgressors, and acknowledged that the Scriptures seem to speak of some as given over to "incurable blindness." (Sermons on Striving to Enter in at the Strait Gate; Sermons on God's Goodness; Answer to Mr. Cleaveland, quoted in Alden Bradford's Life of Mayhew.)

[1] Richard Eddy says: "Mr. Winchester's religious views differed but little from Arminian orthodoxy, except in regard to the design and duration of punishment." (Universalism in America, i. 247.)

While Murray called himself a Trinitarian, it is understood that his views on the Godhead were of a Sabellian cast. Elhanan Winchester, on the other hand, so far as we have been able to discover, was not interested to improve on the ordinary Trinitarian theory. For a time the Universalists appear to have regarded themselves as a Trinitarian body. But the leaven of Unitarianism began early to work in some of their societies.

There was also a drift in the views entertained respecting the future state. Murray regarded those dying in their impenitence as subject in the other world to divine chastisements or painful consequences of sin, though he seems to have thought of these as having place only in the interval between death and the general judgment.[1] Winchester held a more emphatic theory, teaching that sharp punishments, covering, perchance, thousands of years, and reaching beyond the judgment, will be visited upon the more obdurate sinners. That death is the end of pain for all men was not the belief of the great majority of the first Universalists. Their Convention, held at Philadelphia in 1791, set forth the denominational position as follows: "We believe that all that die without the knowledge of their salvation in Christ Jesus must be called unbelievers, and in the Scripture sense do die in their sins; that such will not be purged from their sins or unbelief by death, but necessarily must appear in the next state under all that darkness, fear, and torment, and conscious guilt which is the natural consequence of

[1] Some Hints relative to the Forming of a Christian Church, quoted in Richard Eddy's Universalism in America, i. 370–372.

the unbelief of the truth. What may be the degree or duration of this state of unbelief and misery we know not."[1] But in the same year that this statement was recorded, Murray wrote as though some Universalists were in favor of the notion that death will place all men upon a level, and release all alike from every form of suffering. He combated the frivolous imagination very earnestly. It was destined, nevertheless, to make large headway, for a season, in the Universalist body.

The Unitarian drift among the Universalists was part of a wider movement. But of that movement, or the rise and progress of Unitarianism in New England, we can speak more appropriately in a subsequent chapter.

VIII. — QUESTIONS OF MORALS AND REFORM.

The strict keeping of Sunday was a characteristic of New England throughout the colonial era. Between the long services of the sanctuary, two of which were held by daylight, and the pious duties of the home, the day was so largely preoccupied that there would have been little room for diversion even had it been tolerated. Outside of New England, Sunday observance was less rigidly enforced. Virginia, it is true, started out with a strict injunction on the subject. But the scattered state of the population in that province, as in much of the South, placed the conduct of the people beyond the reach of careful oversight. Moreover, there was no such grim pertinacity in this quarter, on the part of ministers and magistrates, as was needful to sustain a

[1] Eddy, i. 349, 350.

strict Sabbath régime. In New England it was early a question whether the sacred day should begin at sunset, or at midnight, of Saturday. "The former computation was favored in Connecticut. The latter was approved by Massachusetts law."[1]

Theatrical plays were regarded in the earlier times of New England as little better than sacrifices to the devil. In Boston a license for such diversions was first granted after the close of the colonial period. In their opposition to the theatre the Quakers agreed with the Puritans. The early laws of Pennsylvania forbade theatrical exhibitions "as tending to looseness and immorality." It was nearly seventy years before an attempt was made to introduce them into the province, and then they encountered a strong opposition.[2] In New York, as well as in Philadelphia, a large party was in favor of excluding the theatre, as late as 1785. Baltimore, on the other hand, and some other places were at that date quite enthusiastic patrons of the histrionic art.[3]

In the direction of prison reform the colonial history shows very little trace of any humanitarian impulse. Some of the prisons, in their structure, appointments, and discipline, were a disgrace to civilization, pest-houses both physically and morally.[4]

The drinking habits of the people were little to their credit. Probably excess was not very common till the

[1] Palfrey, History of New England, ii. 44.

[2] Bowden, History of the Society of Friends in America, ii. 287, 288.

[3] J. B. McMaster, History of the People of the United States, i. 83–95.

[4] Ibid., i. 98–102.

closing part of the seventeenth century; but from that time the waste and wreckage of the rum traffic covered an ever-enlarging area. The social code of the times made the proffering of liquors a matter of ordinary hospitality. They were expected to grace festival occasions, and were a regular appendix to funeral solemnities.

A vital sense of the enormous evils of intemperance seems first to have been aroused near the end of the eighteenth century. We read indeed that in the early days of the colonies some effort was made to restrict the sale of the deadly fire-water to the Indians; that Governor Winthrop opposed the custom of drinking healths as being accessory to intemperance; that the laws of Connecticut placed restrictions on the drinking of spirituous liquors, forbidding that a certain quantity should be exceeded at one time, and that tippling should occur after a certain hour in the evening.[1] We read also that rum was a prohibited article in Georgia from the founding of the colony. But the prohibitory policy was soon abandoned in Georgia, and such restrictions as were put on record elsewhere were of little practical avail. Temperance agitation, as a thing of persistence and increasing momentum, did not begin till the last quarter of the eighteenth century. The Methodist body at this time, in harmony with the precepts of Wesley, took decided action against the traffic in ardent spirits. The Conference of 1780 voted to disown any members engaged in the traffic. Three years later the Conference enjoined the preachers to instruct the people to keep clear of the wrong of making and selling liquors,

[1] Elliott, New England History, i 463.

and also of using them "as drams." In the "General Rules," as approved by the Conference of 1784, refraining from buying, selling, and drinking spirituous liquors was included among the necessary outward tokens of a serious Christian purpose. Near the same time the Quakers, at their Yearly Meeting in New England, obligated themselves to the maintenance of temperance principles in their Society. In 1785 Dr. Benjamin Rush, of Philadelphia, appeared as an able champion of the temperance cause in an essay entitled "The Effects of Ardent Spirits on the Human Mind and Body;" and in subsequent years his zeal for the reform was repeatedly manifested. The first temperance association in this country was formed in 1789 by two hundred or more farmers of Litchfield County, Connecticut, who pledged themselves to carry on their business without the use of distilled spirits as an article of refreshment for themselves or for those in their employ.[1]

In a previous connection notice was taken of the spread of anti-slavery sentiments among civilians. It remains for us here to observe the advances made by such sentiments in the different religious communions.

The Quakers were among the foremost to protest against slavery, and to free themselves from all connection with the institution. As early as 1688 the German Quakers residing in Germantown, Pennsylvania, urged the inconsistency of buying, selling, and enslaving men. In 1696 the Yearly Meeting for that province advised the members of the Society to guard in the future against importing African slaves. In

[1] See Daniel Dorchester, Liquor Problem in All Ages; also, History of Christianity in the United States, pp. 351–355.

1710 the Pennsylvania legislature, consisting mostly of Quakers, prohibited any further importation of negroes. Shortly after the middle of the century, influenced by such apostles of emancipation as John Woolman and Anthony Benezet, the Quakers adopted a more decided policy. The Yearly Meeting of Pennsylvania in 1755 concluded that any member of the Society who should be concerned in importing or buying slaves ought to be reported for discipline. Three years later it was ordered that any persons buying, selling, or holding slaves should not be allowed to take part in the affairs of the Church. In 1776 it was voted to disown members who were in possession of slaves, and who would not execute proper instruments for giving them their freedom.[1]

The Congregationalists had come generally, before the close of the Revolutionary era, to be opposed to slavery. Samuel Hopkins of Newport bore an honorable part in stirring up conscience on the subject.

The Presbyterians at the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, in 1787, commended the interest manifested in the different States for promoting the abolition of slavery, and advised that care should be taken to educate those in bondage, so that they might be able to make a worthy use of freedom.

The Methodist Conference of 1780 pronounced slavery "contrary to the laws of God, man, and nature, and hurtful to society." It voted also to advise all Methodists to give freedom to their slaves. The General Conference of 1784 went still farther, and assumed

[1] Bowden, History of the Society of Friends in America; Clarkson, Abolition of the African Slave-Trade.

to command instead of merely advising. In States where the laws allowed of manumission, it required every member, as a condition of continued fellowship, to emancipate, within a prescribed term of years, all slaves in his possession, and ordered that in the future no slaveholder should be counted eligible to membership.[1] It was found, however, very difficult to carry through so heroic a measure. A large majority of Methodists were at that time residents of States in which slaveholding was a common practice. So strong an opposition was raised to the requisition of emancipation that the ministers felt that its execution was impracticable, and before the close of 1785 notice was given that a future Conference would consider the requisition in question, its immediate enforcement being waived. A retreat having once been made, it was no easy task to regain the former ground. In its "General Rules," however, the Methodist Church never ceased to keep on record a protest against slavery.

Strong ground was taken against slavery by the Baptist Associations in Virginia (1787, 1789). They declared hereditary bondage a "violent deprivation of the rights of nature."[2] In the practical application of such views, however, the Baptists were subject to much the same embarrassments as the Methodists.

At the first Convention of Universalists, held in Philadelphia in 1790, the following resolution was adopted: "We believe it to be inconsistent with the

[1] Leroy M. Lee, Life and Times of Jesse Lee, pp. 165, 166; H. N. McTyeire, History of Methodism, pp. 377, 378.

[2] History of the Rise and Progress of the Baptists in Virginia, pp. 79, 303, 304.

union of the human race in a common Saviour, and the obligations to mutual and universal love which flow from that union, to hold any part of our fellow-creatures in bondage. We therefore recommend a total refraining from the African trade, and the adoption of prudent measures for the gradual abolition of the slavery of the negroes in our country."[1]

The record shows unmistakably that opposition to slavery, on moral and religious grounds, was very widespread in the American churches in the years immediately following the declaration and the achievement of the country's independence.

[1] Eddy, Universalism in America, i. 301.

CHAPTER III.

FRANCE AND OTHER ROMAN CATHOLIC COUNTRIES OF CONTINENTAL EUROPE FROM THE DEATH OF LOUIS XIV. TO THE OVERTHROW OF NAPOLEON I. (1715–1815).

I. — THE POLITICAL MOVEMENT IN FRANCE.

IN approaching this subject one naturally measures back from the Revolution of 1789. All other inquiries become secondary to that respecting the causes of the great upheaval which overturned the monarchy and the associated institutions.

Giving at once the result of our investigation, we would enumerate these causes as follows: (1) forfeiture of respect on the part of the rulers by moral turpitude; (2) the vacillating policy of the government, or its alternation between concession and despotic authority; (3) bitter religious controversies, in which the government united with a majority of the higher clergy to override the preference of the great body of the people; (4) ambition of the parliaments, and especially of the Parliament of Paris, to reach the position, and to fulfil the functions of a co-ordinate branch of the government; (5) political writings which discredited the notion of absolute monarchy, and set forth the superior merits of republican or democratic rule; (6) discontent in large masses of the people, provoked by poverty and hunger.

Before the burial of Louis XIV. the eyes of Frenchmen had begun to be opened to the shadowed side of his reign. Looking beyond the glory of royalty they saw the tyranny and the shame. Very few mourned the death of the magnificent despot.

The succeeding rulers were in no wise calculated to make good the deficit in esteem and veneration which had already been incurred. On the contrary, they perpetuated all the shame of the reign of Louis XIV. without reproducing aught of its glory. The Duke of Orleans, who acted as regent during the minority of the King, was an unblushing libertine. Louis XV., in his personal habits, was a disgrace to royalty throughout the greater part of his long reign. As in the times of Henry III., the mistress bore the sceptre, and religion was abased to the semblance of a vapid and despicable superstition by being mixed with moral outrage and indecency. Louis XVI. was doubtless exemplary in his general conduct, but he had not sufficient force of character to recover lost prestige.

The forfeiture of respect which had been wrought in this manner was aggravated by the unsteadiness of the administration. While the monarch affronted the growing taste for self-government by repeating the assumptions of Louis XIV. and claiming once and again to be the impersonation of the entire sovereignty of the realm, he did not maintain himself firmly upon this ground. Yielding at times to popular disquiet, he gave indulgence to the party representing opposing claims. Concessions of this sort, not having the appearance of free gifts, won no gratitude, and only served to encourage to new efforts those who, from in-

terest or principle, were desirous to limit the authority of the crown. The people were neither crowded down to passivity by a strong despotism nor made content by a liberal treatment.

The crowning indiscretion of the government was in the management of religious affairs. Following the behests of the Jesuits and the Pope, it loaned its power to the base enterprise of enthroning a dogmatic constitution — the bull Unigenitus — which struck not only at the roots of Gallicanism, but at the foundations of morality itself. A partial exposition of this astonishing document has been given in the preceding volume, and further reference will be made to it presently. What we wish to emphasize here is the fact that the miserable and harassing measures by which the obnoxious constitution was enforced revolted profoundly the greater part of the thinking element in the nation, and well-nigh precipitated an outbreak more than a generation before the Revolution. This is abundantly indicated by reports which have come down to us from the middle part of the eighteenth century. The Memoirs of the Marquis d'Argenson, for example, show that, while yet the school of free-thinkers was in its incipiency, and had done comparatively little toward leavening the popular mind with innovating opinions, a revolutionary stir was in the air. As early as 1743 we find him writing: "Revolution is certain to come in this State; it is crumbling at its foundations; one has only to detach himself from his country, and to prepare to pass under other masters and some other form of government."[1] In 1751 he wrote: "There is much

[1] Mémoires, iv. 83.

questioning in the minds of the people respecting this impending revolution in the government; nothing else is talked about, and all classes, even down to the peasants, are imbued with the subject."[1] A few months later he recorded this reflection: "Will despotism increase, or will it diminish in France? For my part, I hold to the second alternative, and prophesy even the coming of a republic. I have seen in my days the respect and love of the people for royalty diminish. Louis XV. has not known how to govern either as tyrant or as the good chief of a republic. Evil hour for the royal authority when one undertakes neither rôle!"[2] In various passages, D'Argenson indicates with sufficient distinctness his conviction that the revolutionary ferment which he describes had its origin largely in resentments against the pressure and violence with which the theological scheme of a faction was imposed upon the nation.[3] In fine, the bull Unigenitus, or the plot which it served, fulfilled no inconspicuous part in laying the train for the explosion which was to leave palace and throne in fragments.

Aside from the general import of the Unigenitus controversy, as exasperating the minds of a large body of the people, it had a special political bearing, inasmuch as it gave to the Parliament of Paris the means of magnifying its own importance. In its proper character this body, like the several provincial parliaments, had no legislative functions. Its special office in connection with the making or promulgation of laws was the formal registration of them. But in course of time it

[1] Mémoires, vii. 23.

[2] Ibid., vii. 242.

[3] Ibid., vi. 453, 454; viii. 35.

began to esteem its function in registration as something more than simply ministerial. It assumed the prerogative to delay in the matter, and to interpose objections to royal decrees. Under the powerful absolutism of Louis XIV. it was indeed overawed and reduced to a quiescent attitude. But in the subsequent era its bent to independent action was repeatedly manifested. The odiousness of the royal policy in the controversy over the papal constitution gave to it the support of a powerful party. It was inspired, therefore, with confidence to resist the royal will again and again. This continued antagonism was naturally fruitful of political thinking. While the parliament, as actually constituted, was rather a privileged body than a representative assembly, its position over against the monarch was analogous to that of such an assembly, and helped to foster the idea that government is a matter which belongs to the nation, and not merely to the king. Touching upon this point D'Argenson wrote in 1754: "It is observed that never before have the names of *Nation* and *State* been repeated as they are to-day. These two names were not pronounced under Louis XIV., and the very idea which belongs to them was wanting. The people have never been so well instructed as to-day in the rights of the nation and of liberty." [1]

It may be concluded from the above that the movement in favor of limited monarchy and the prerogatives of the nation did not wait for formal political treatises. Writings of this order, however, came forward to reinforce the movement. In 1748 appeared Montesquieu's

[1] Mémoires, viii. 315.

"Spirit of Laws." This in its general animus was far from being an inflammatory or revolutionary book. Political problems are discussed therein with great circumspection, and with large reference to historical data. Still it requires no great keenness of insight to discover in the treatise an underlying hostility to unrestricted monarchy. Tokens of this hostility are found in the favorable judgment of Montesquieu upon the system of mutual checks appearing in the English government; in his conviction that the union in the same person of legislative with executive or judicial functions is incompatible with liberty; and in his declaration that virtue is a necessary foundation for a republic, while the principle of honor suffices for a monarchy, and that of fear answers the needs of a despotism. His reflections go to enforce the conclusion that the republican is intrinsically the higher form of government, and should be introduced wherever suitable conditions for its maintenance exist.

Fourteen years after the publication of the "Spirit of Laws," Jean Jacques Rousseau gave to France the treatise which became ere long the Bible of the ultra revolutionists. The "Social Contract" was a genuine specimen of *doctrinaire* politics. It takes indeed some account of the diverse requisites of different stages in the progress of nations, as also of the characteristics resulting from special experiences and environments. Still the practical difficulties which are likely to be encountered in the application of theories are but lightly regarded. General maxims are enthroned, and pushed boldly to their consequences.

According to Rousseau, the State originates in a con-

vention or contract. For the sake of the greater good of order, protection, and secure sustenance, men resign the independence belonging to them in the state of nature. Thus the community is constituted. As in forming the community all make an entire surrender of their separate rights, they stand in their new relations upon a precise legal equality. The surrender being made, not to this or that individual, but to the whole body, no place is left for personal precedence as respects rights or authority. Inasmuch as an entire surrender is made by all, an unrestricted sovereignty is constituted. This sovereignty inheres in the whole body. The people in their collective capacity are the sovereign. The general will is the supreme authority. The executive, whether king or president, has only to fulfil the general will. He is but the agent of the sovereign. For this agent to act in any wise as the principal, or to usurp any part of the sovereignty, is to break the pact on which the community is founded. When the people are in assembly, as they hold the undivided sovereignty, they can cancel any delegated authority, and adopt any new plan of administration which may command their suffrage or the suffrage of a majority. In fine, as is evident from this outline, the political ideal set forth by Rousseau, was that of an omnipotent democracy, held within no definite limits by organic laws, and unembarrassed by any positive guaranties of historical continuity in its action. Grant that he was not himself a revolutionary zealot, and that he spoke of the dangers which accrue from sudden transitions in government, his book was nevertheless well adapted to be the delight of any hasty and impas-

sioned theorists who should determine to establish at once a political millennium. Amid the great hopes and enthusiasms which were evoked by the assembling of the States-General, or the national representatives, in 1789, the "Social Contract" was thoroughly adapted to gratify and to stimulate a throng of eager minds.

If the presentation of new and alluring ideals kindled the desire of change in some minds, there were large numbers in France who needed no speculative incentive to make them long for a different order of things. Their misery was so near the utmost extremity that the notion of change could hardly signify to them anything else than the possibility of relief. The great body of the peasantry lived on the border of abject penury, so that any unusual dearth exposed them to starvation. Many died of want in 1739 and 1740. The like misery was experienced in 1750, 1751, and 1753. There was also a famine in 1770 and in 1773. The winter of 1789, which preceded the opening of the States-General, was a time of great distress. Now it lay in the nature of the case that so much misery should provoke a popular ferment. Men cannot remain quiet under an intolerable lot. The peasantry too had some excuse for revolutionary fever, since no small part of their hardships was due to a most oppressive and unequal system of taxation, which granted large exemptions to the wealthy, and so threw the principal burden upon the poor laborers.

These causes of political crisis were reinforced in some measure by the successful struggle of the American colonies, and the close association of France with them in that struggle. "The American war," says

Henri Martin, "at once postponed and paved the way for the Revolution; it afforded a temporary diversion abroad to the most energetic sentiments of France; but these sentiments returned to us, defined and strengthened by the sight of facts more powerful than books and theories."[1]

The years which followed the accession of Louis XVI. (1774) were less stormy than some of those which had preceded. The relative calm might have led an observer to think that the forces of upheaval had been dissipated. But it only needed a special occasion to reveal their presence and energy. When the discovery of a serious deficit in the treasury brought the government into embarrassment, and made it willing to issue the call for the assembling of the States-General, it was speedily made manifest that the idea of a great political regeneration was in many minds.

The barriers of conservatism in the States-General were at once broken down by the successful contention of the commons that the nobles and the clergy should unite with them instead of forming separate houses. The Constituent Assembly which was thus organized yielded more and more to an impetuous demand for change. Many useful reforms were indeed accomplished. Overgrown privileges were cancelled, and various elements of crudity and arbitrariness were eliminated from the judicial system of the realm. But the prudent mean failed to be observed. Legislation so far outran the inclination of a large part of the nation that a fearful discord was made inevitable. Not content to take from the nobility anomalous rights

[1] Histoire de France, tome xvi p 442 in Eng. translation.

which had been transmitted from the feudal system, the Assembly proceeded to sweep away the estate itself. The clergy were treated with almost as scant forbearance, and the Church was remodelled in defiance of its traditions and preferences.

The Legislative Assembly, which met in October, 1791, had less of the restraints of sober wisdom and prudence than its predecessor. The National Convention of the next year marked a still further descent. The enthusiast, the theorist, and the demagogue were now at the front. Men with no political education and no equipment for the task of statesmen except a stock of phrases and abstractions undertook to make over society from top to bottom. With the King sent to the scaffold (January, 1793), and the old institutions overturned, they esteemed themselves ready to bring in the golden age of liberty and equality. Before the glory of the new régime the meagre past faded completely out of sight, and it was thought best to reckon time from the autumnal equinox of 1792, and in place of the weekly festival of the resurrection to substitute the decade of days.

Meanwhile the presence of insurrection and the danger of foreign invasion gave a sombre tinge to enthusiasm. Those who had been most voluble in praise of brotherhood and liberty were quick to assail with inquisitorial rigor any who dared to think otherwise than themselves. To secure liberty for the future, it was thought necessary to smite it to the earth in the present. So the "reign of terror" was inaugurated. Government became the spoil of the most unscrupulous and inexorable. The National Convention was subordi-

nated to the revolutionary club. "Paris holds France down while a handful of revolutionists tyrannize over Paris."[1] The words of Madame de Staël are scarcely too strong to describe the course of events during the fourteen months which followed the proscription of the Girondists at the hands of the Jacobins (May 31, 1793). "There seemed," she writes, "to be a constant descent, like that which Dante describes, from circle to circle, toward a lower plane in hell. To the fierce hate against the nobles and the priests one saw succeed the irritation against land-owners, then against talents, then against beauty itself; finally against everything which remained of the great and the generous in human nature."[2] The number of lives sacrificed by massacre or execution, though far from inconsiderable, may not have been without its parallels. Indeed, for that matter, the unbridled ambition of Napoleon was vastly more cruel than the fury of the Jacobin chiefs. For the thousands who were destroyed at their beck, there were tens of thousands of Frenchmen who found their graves in Spain and Russia. It was the vindictiveness with which all eminence and merit were assailed that made "the reign of terror" a period of unique horror.

As might have been prophesied, and in fact was prophesied, the excesses of the Revolution prepared for the return of despotism. The rule of the Directory was not such as to assure or reconcile the large number who had been alienated by the preceding violence. From a state of fever and over tension there followed

[1] H. A. Taine, The French Revolution.

[2] Considérations sur les Principaux Evénements de la Révolution Française, ii. 112.

naturally a condition of relaxation or relative political indifference. At the same time a new idol was brought forward to share the homage which had been rendered at the shrine of liberty and equality. The eyes of Frenchmen were dazzled by the military glory which the marvellous generalship of Napoleon Bonaparte had secured for their armies. They interposed, therefore, no serious obstacle to the several steps by which the military captain ascended to the imperial dignity (1799–1804).

The rule of Napoleon, whatever elements of respectability it may have embraced, was the nullification of all that the more generous and liberal minds of France had been striving for in the preceding generations. Never before the fall of the Bastile had there been a more thorough despotism than that which he introduced. Intrinsically the Napoleonic régime was a dwarfing absolutism, and had not its effects been offset in a measure by the great enterprise of exterior conquests, it would stand clearly revealed as such in the history of France.

II. — THE SCEPTICAL MOVEMENT.

An acute observer of events wrote in 1753: "The loss of religion in France cannot properly be attributed to the English philosophy, which has gained at Paris only a hundred philosophers, but to the hatred conceived toward the clergy which now runs to an excess. Scarcely can these ministers of religion show themselves on the streets without being hooted; and all this comes from the bull Unigenitus, and from the disgrace

of the Parliament."[1] The next year the same writer expressed himself in terms like these: "It is the priests who push from all sides into these troubles and this disorder, and so the minds of men are turned to discontent and disobedience, and everything is moving onward to a great revolution in religion as well as in government."[2]

That this verdict of a contemporary has considerable plausibility cannot be denied. It is reasonable to suppose that the bull Unigenitus, violently enforced as it was, was provocative of scepticism. When an authority, claiming supreme and divine right over Christendom, condemned propositions which have an exact equivalent in the New Testament, and undertook to teach men that the *fear of an unjust excommunication ought to hinder one from doing his duty*,[3] it is not strange that various individuals, who had imperfectly learned the art of blind obedience, and did not wish to be put to shame by pagans, should think it time to look around for some system compatible with common sense and instinctive morality. Nor will it be strange if the like quest should yet be repeated in France and elsewhere, now that the action of the Vatican council has assigned to this specimen of papal wisdom an indubitable place in the moral code of the Romish Church.

Still, it is not proper to burden a single cause with

[1] D'Argenson, Mémoires, viii. 35. [2] Ibid. viii. 242.

[3] All shuffling apart, no different meaning can be drawn from the condemnation of the following: Excommunicationis injustæ metus, nunquam debet nos impedire ab implendo debito nostro: nunquam eximus ab ecclesia, etiam quando hominum nequitiâ videmur ab ea expulsi, quando Deo, Jesu Christo, atque ipsi ecclesiæ per charitatem affixi sumus.

responsibility for results which have flowed from several causes. While the Unigenitus scandal had a baleful efficiency, it but added momentum to a current already started. Back of the sceptical movement of the eighteenth century in general lay the intolerant dogmatism which dominated so large a part of Europe through the seventeenth century. In France especially this dogmatism had taken on a hideous aspect from the time that Louis XIV. laid his hand to the task of extirpating Protestantism. While thus despotic intolerance provoked reaction, the moral levity and corruption which invaded the higher circles of French society in the first half of the eighteenth century favored laxity of belief. Men who lived practically as materialists and epicureans were not well braced against the materialistic and agnostic creed. An appreciable influence may also be attributed to the sensational philosophy and deistical school of England. The soil had been so well prepared in France that the types of thought which they presented could hardly fail to take root there.

An early work of Montesquieu, which achieved no little popularity, gives us a token of relaxed belief. In his "Persian Letters" (1721), we see, if not the same sparkle and piquancy which were put into the "Praise of Folly," a freedom in dealing with the affairs of the Church as bold as that which Erasmus had exhibited in his humorous critique. These Letters, assuming to be written by Persian visitors in France, make the Pope to figure as the head magician, who enforces belief in defiance of mathematics and the evidences of the senses, and who, in order to keep up the habit of belief in Christians, issues articles from time to time, a

recent and much talked-of constitution being an example. Remarks in a similar vein are passed upon various classes of ecclesiastics. A principal function of the bishops, it is said, is the granting of dispensations. It is characteristic of Christianity that it imposes an infinite number of practices, and inasmuch as it is esteemed more difficult to fulfil these practices than to support bishops to dispense from them, the latter alternative is chosen. This dispensing power reaches even to the cancelling of a sworn engagement. Confessors are a kind of dervishes who do not suit the interests of heirs so well as the physicians. Casuists have a great function to perform in showing men how many sins they can commit without perilling their salvation by a mortal fault. They are also very useful in taking away from sins their sinful quality by persuading the doer that they were not really sins, it being an acknowledged principle that it is not the act itself, but rather the conviction of the doer respecting the act, which determines its moral character. A commentator is one who searches the Bible to find there his own views, — a method that is fruitful of variety; in fact, there are about as many points of dispute as there are lines in the Scriptures. A heretic does not fare the same in all regions. In France and Germany he will get clear by making a distinction; but in Spain and Portugal they do not care to listen to dogmatic refinements. A peculiar stroke of politeness has place in Spain. As a captain there will not beat a soldier without first asking his permission, so the Inquisition never burns a Jew without making excuses to him. The numerous stories told about the wrestling of the

old monks with the devil indicate that they did not keep very good company. The monastic institute is at present a great check upon national progress. From this point of view, "it is certain that the religion of the Protestants gives them an infinite advantage over the Catholics. I venture to say that, in the condition in which Europe is now found, it is not possible for the Catholic religion to subsist five hundred years." [1]

The veil of humor is not so thick as to hide effectually the real opinions of the author of the "Lettres Persanes." Their import, conjoined with other evidence, leaves no doubt that the papal system was to him a dead letter. His positive creed is not determined with quite the same certainty. Probably it affiliated with that type of deism which was outlined later in the century by Rousseau. He is said to have persevered in his way of thinking to the end. To the Jesuits, who approached him in his last sickness, and urged upon him the duty of retracting, he made only this answer: "I have always respected religion; the morality of the gospel is the best gift that God could have made to mankind."

Montesquieu died in 1755. Voltaire was then at the middle point of his career. More than twenty-five years before, he had taken the pen of the author, and he was unceasingly occupied with literary tasks till his death in 1778.

In Voltaire more than in any other Frenchman, the sceptical revival of the eighteenth century found its impersonation. He supplied to it a more penetrative genius and a vaster industry than any one of his coun-

[1] See Letters xxiv., xxix., xxxv., lvii., lxxviii., lxxxv., xciii., cxvii., cxxxiv.

trymen besides.[1] In the latter respect, indeed, he has few equals in the annals of literature. He was as prodigiously busy in his way as was his contemporary, John Wesley, in a far different way.

As respects the native endowments of Voltaire, it is sufficiently obvious that he was a man of great swiftness and versatility of intellectual movement. With these gifts was associated another which made for them a well-nigh perfect vehicle. Voltaire was a great word-artist. Never was language a more obedient subject to any one than was the French speech to him. The very clearness of his discourse was adapted to work conviction by giving an impression of mastery. Add to this a subtle wit, a unique gift for raillery, and one can see that this man was well prepared to impress powerfully that restless generation.

What has been said describes brilliancy rather than profundity. The latter, in fact, cannot be claimed for Voltaire. While in many relations he showed an admirable keenness of perception, he was not largely endowed with the philosophic faculty, and his impetuous temper was opposed to the prolonged and severe reflection which needs to be expended upon the deeper problems of human thinking. He had no aptitude or relish for anything transcendental. To the realm of grandeur and spiritual suggestiveness he was well-nigh a stranger, as appears from his estimate of the antique poets, of Shakspeare, and of others.[2] Dwelling always

[1] The genius of the Genevese Rousseau was doubtless equally penetrating, but his literary activity was less extensive.

[2] The following from Martin may be compared: "An essentially active and polemic genius, with little depth and immense surface, he re-

upon the surface of the earth in his emotions and affections, he was conspicuously lacking in the sense for the ideal and the infinite. A real awe for holiness seemed to be no part of his experience. Taste rather than principle was at the basis of such repugnance as he entertained for gross vices. Any great amount of moral fastidiousness certainly cannot be ascribed to the author of "La Pucelle."

Some of the biographers of Voltaire credit him with a fair measure of truthfulness. Probably he was truthful in the sense that he would not lie for the mere pleasure of the performance. But when occasion pressed he did not spare a falsehood, and his life was prolific in pressing occasions. The way in which he evaded responsibility for his books involved a continuous chain of deceitful innuendoes from the beginning to the end of his career. The expedients which he employed to gain admission to the French Academy justify the statement that he crawled to the coveted honor over a road paved with flatteries and falsehoods. His presentation of himself for the communion, and insistence upon his title to absolution as being a good Catholic, was an audacious stroke in mendacity, which might well have provoked the Father of Lies to envy. Voltaire, it is true, had his excuse; but the excuse when sifted down amounts simply to the conclusion that his personal comfort and safety were so precious as to justify any amount of crookedness. In the company of his friends,

jected what was profound like what was obscure, what was abstract like what was subtle, and turned with instinctive repugnance from everything that was mysterious." (Histoire de France, tome xv., p. 330 in Eng. translation.)

Voltaire himself was not far from putting the case in this form. Being asked one day by his secretary what he would have done if he had been born in Spain, he replied: "I would have gone to mass every day; I would have kissed the sleeve of the monks; and I would have tried to set fire to all their convents." This may have been the language of pleasantry; but in what different light did he figure when posing before a Romish altar as a good Catholic, while at the same time he was laboring with full energy to tear down the whole fabric of Roman Catholic faith and authority?

If the above shows the weakest and basest side of Voltaire in respect of feeling and conduct, his abhorrence of intolerance and his generous efforts in behalf of outraged Protestants and other victims of oppression present his best side. It cannot, indeed, be claimed that his habit of thought and feeling provided any complete basis for tolerance. There was in his mind too little respect for man as man. The pride of intellect which made him look with a species of contempt upon the masses, and allowed him to speak of them as *canaille*, was not intrinsically the best sort of foundation for a high type of tolerance. Still it would be niggardly not to credit Voltaire with an honest and intense abhorrence of intolerant bigotry. A long series of acts sustains his words on this subject, and makes credible his assertion that he felt a touch of fever on each returning anniversary of the Saint Bartholomew massacre. One will be the less tempted to see mere rhetoric in this declaration, when he remembers that still in Voltaire's time that stupendous crime was pub-

licly celebrated as a great triumph of the Christian Church.[1]

The intolerance practised in the assumed interest of Christianity, if it did not create the infidel animosity in the heart of Voltaire, supplied it with fuel, and added to it many degrees of intensity. Ultimately, as is well known, a tolerably white heat was reached. In the private correspondence of Voltaire, during the last twenty years of his life, this intensified animosity glared forth in the formula *Écrasez l'Infâme*, "Crush the Monster."

What is the meaning of these sinister-looking words? Some have supposed them to refer to the Christian religion, or even to the central figure in that religion. That Voltaire had no faith in Christianity as a revealed religion, and would have been glad to see it displaced by a deistic creed, is entirely certain. But that he meant to apply this intolerant formula specifically and unqualifiedly to the Christian religion, admits of some doubt. A biographer who may be presumed to have looked carefully through the evidence draws this conclusion: "The 'Infâme' of Voltaire was not religion, nor the Christian religion, nor the Roman Catholic Church. It was *religion claiming supernatural authority, and enforcing that authority by pains and penalties*. This is the fairest answer to the question, taking his whole life into view."[2] Not disputing

[1] In the city of Toulouse the anniversary of the massacre was regularly celebrated as a two days' festival, under sanction of municipal law and a papal bull. (Parton, Life of Voltaire, ii. 353.)

[2] Parton, Life of Voltaire, ii. 286. Carlyle, who had no inconsiderable occasion to look into the views and schemes of the great sceptic, says: "Voltaire is deeply alive to the horrors and miseries which have

this conclusion, we would still suggest that if the aggressive ecclesiasticism of the Romish Church was reckoned by Voltaire an inseparable characteristic, he certainly had an ardent desire for the destruction of that Church.

In writings designed for the public, ridicule, generally managed with sufficient skill to avoid the appearance of brusqueness, was Voltaire's favorite weapon of attack. Nor was this belligerent facetiousness wholly confined to words. His jesting ran over into deeds, when by feigning sickness he forced an unwilling priest to grant him absolution, or when he secured a friendly letter from the Pope, or when finally he obtained from Rome a piece of the hair shirt of Saint Francis, to serve as a relic in the church which he had built upon his estate at Ferney. The relic is said to have arrived on the same day as the portrait of Madame Pompadour, the potent mistress of the King, — a circumstance which

issued on mankind from a Fanatic Popish Superstition, or Creed of Incredibilities, — which (except from the throat outwards, from the bewildered tongue outwards) the orthodox themselves cannot believe, but only pretend and struggle to believe. This, Voltaire calls 'The Infamous;' and this — what name can any of us give it? The man who believes in falsities is very miserable. The man who cannot believe them, but only struggles and pretends to believe, and yet, being armed with the power of the sword, industriously keeps menacing and slashing all round, to compel every neighbor to do like him, — what is to be done with such a man? Human Nature calls him a Social Nuisance; needing to be handcuffed, gagged, and abated. Human Nature, if it be in a terrified and imperilled state, with the sword of this fellow swashing around it, calls him 'Infamous,' and a Monster of Chaos. He is indeed the select Monster of that region; the Patriarch of all the Monsters, little as he dreams of being such. . . . More signal enemy to God, and friend of the Other Party, walks not the Earth in our day." (History of Frederick the Great, xiii. 6, 7.)

led Voltaire to remark that he was now very well both for this world and for the other.

The positive creed of Voltaire requires no prolix description, since it was neither extensive nor original. It was essentially the deistic creed of Bolingbroke, to whose tuition he was not a little indebted in his earlier years. While granting the existence of God, he had small confidence in the soul's immortality. It is thought, however, that near the close of life he became less doubtful upon the latter subject.

Opposition to the current faith was so much of a recommendation in the eyes of Voltaire, that the greater part of the radical unbelievers shared his regard, nctwithstanding considerable divergence, in some instances, from his platform. The sceptical school — if school it can be called— exhibited in truth but moderate homogeneity. Buffon, the distinguished naturalist, the first three volumes of whose work were published in 1749, appears in peculiar contrast with Voltaire, inasmuch as he had a tolerably firm faith in immortality, and only a wavering belief in the existence of God. Among the chief authors of the "Encyclopedia" (1750-1765) D'Alembert gravitated toward universal scepticism, while Diderot embraced a sort of pantheistic naturalism. Positive atheism and materialism were represented by D'Holbach, Lamettrie, and Helvetius. As regards the tone of the "Encyclopedia," it should be noticed that a prudent regard to the peril of suppression dictated a measure of reserve and compromise. We find D'Alembert writing as follows, in answer to some strictures from Voltaire: "Doubtless we have some bad articles on theology and metaphy-

sics; but with a theological censorship and an official privilege, I defy you to make them better. There are other articles, less conspicuous, in which all errors are corrected. Time will demonstrate the distinction between what we have thought and what we have said." [1]

While the "Encyclopedia" was in process of publication, a work appeared (1762), which caused the sceptics to look askance. Not a few of them, Voltaire included, felt that there was an alien vein in the new production that boded no good to their cause. We refer to the treatise on education, "Émile, ou De L'Éducation," by Jean Jacques Rousseau. In the midst of this treatise occurs the Savoyard Vicar's profession of faith. While this assumes to be simply a specimen of religious method, or of the manner in which a pupil may be led into the domain of pious belief, it is doubtless a compendium of Rousseau's own convictions. A glance into it will show that the sceptics of the era had reason to regard it with a jealous eye. It was not congenial to their negations. While it admitted grave objections to positive revelation, it recognized elements foreign to their system, since it gave a large significance to the innate religious sentiment of man, and eloquently portrayed the unique power of the Christian oracles to satisfy this sentiment. As compared with the writings of contemporary free-thinkers, that of Rousseau had somewhat of a constructive tendency. It was fitted to serve as a stepping-stone out of the blankness into which they were leading. That it exerted a far-reaching influence cannot properly be questioned.

[1] Quoted by Jervis, Church of France. ii. 335.

Rousseau does not make his spokesman, the Savoyard Vicar, entirely to discard reasoning in favor of innate sentiment or spontaneous feeling. Arguments for theism are presented with a fair degree of cogency, and the truth is discreetly set forth that among possible hypotheses all of which are attended with difficulties, the one which best explains known facts is to be preferred. Grounds are also given for predicating the immateriality of the soul. Among these the weighty consideration is touched upon, that materialism, with its mechanical necessity, makes nugatory the distinction between truth and error, between correct and mistaken judgments. But interspersed with discussions of this kind, the opinion is expressed that philosophy has no plummet wherewith to sound these deep subjects, and tends rather to confusion than to enlightenment. "Never has the jargon of metaphysics," it is said, "discovered one single truth." Again it is remarked: "I perceive God in His works, I feel Him in myself, I see Him all around me; but as soon as I attempt to discover where He is, what He is, what is His substance, He escapes me, and my troubled spirit no longer perceives anything. . . . The more I force myself to contemplate this infinite essence, the less I understand it; but it exists; that suffices me; the less I understand it, the more I adore. I humble myself before Him and say: Being of beings, I am because Thou art; it is to raise myself to my source that I meditate upon Thee without ceasing. The most worthy use of my reason is to annihilate itself before Thee: this is the rapture of my spirit, this the charm of my feebleness, to feel myself overwhelmed by Thy grandeur."

In determining the rules of conduct, as in searching for the knowledge of God, philosophy is a vain dependence. The law of right is expressed in the spontaneous convictions and emotions of the soul. "All which I feel to be good is good; all that which I feel to be evil is evil: the best of all casuists is the conscience, and it is only as a man begins to haggle with it that he has recourse to the subtleties of reasoning."

The fountain of religious and moral truth being thus within, an external revelation, it is concluded, cannot be strictly necessary. At least, to make eternal salvation depend upon the acceptance of a particular external revelation involves enormous difficulties. In that case every man would be under obligation to sift the evidence for and against different systems claiming to be revealed from Heaven. The study of their relative claims would be a life and death matter; no other task would be comparable with this in solemnity and import. From this tremendous labor not a single individual of the race could be excused. "If the son of a Christian does well to follow, without a profound and impartial examination, the religion of his father, why would it be evil for the son of a Turk to follow in like manner the religon of his father?" It impeaches the benevolence of God thus to hang the immortal destiny of men upon a choice which in so many instances must be extremely difficult or even impossible. The expedient of the Romanist in asserting the authority of the Church provides no legitimate relief. To be told, "The Church decides that the Church has the right to decide," does not give a man any rational foundation. He is just as much bound to test this assumed right as

he is to test the authority of the assumed revelation, and the former task is every whit as difficult as the latter.

This vigorous protest against a necessary dependence upon external revelation is not meant to be taken as an unequivocal denial of such a revelation. When it comes to the Christian oracles, Rousseau, without stopping to balance arguments, declares that there are proofs which he cannot combat, as well as objections which he cannot solve. It is in this connection that the spirited and oft-quoted passage occurs: "I confess that the majesty of the Scriptures astonishes me, the holiness of the gospel speaks to my heart. Behold the books of the philosophers, with all their pomp; how petty they are in comparison with those writings! Is it possible that a book at once so sublime, and so simple, should be the work of men? Is it possible that he whose history it contains should have been himself only a man? Is that the tone of an enthusiast or of an ambitious sectary? What mildness, what purity in his manners! what touching grace in his teachings! what elevation in his maxims! what profound sagacity in his discourse! what presence of mind, what skill, and what justice in his replies! what sovereignty over the passions! Where is the man, where is the sage, who knows how to act, to suffer, and to die without feebleness and without ostentation? . . . If the life and death of Socrates were those of a sage, the life and death of Jesus were those of a God. Will you tell me that the gospel history was invented at pleasure? My friend, it is not so that invention occurs; and the facts respecting Socrates, doubted by no one, are less per-

fectly attested than those respecting Jesus Christ. In reality this supposition only pushes back the difficulty without overcoming it; it would be more inconceivable that several men should have agreed in fabricating this book than it is that one alone should have furnished the subject. A company of Jewish writers could never have invented either the tone or the morals which are found here; and the gospel has marks of truth so great, so striking, so perfectly inimitable, that the inventor of them would be more astonishing than the hero. With all that, however, this same gospel is full of things incredible and repugnant to reason, and which it is impossible for any man of sense to conceive or to admit. What ought we to do in the midst of all these contradictions? To be always modest and circumspect; to respect in silence that which we are able neither to reject nor to comprehend, and to humble ourselves before the Great Being, who alone knows the truth."

It cannot be denied that Rousseau presented a needful offset to the dry intellectual schemes of the philosophers or would-be philosophers. Sentiment has a place as well as logic in the sanctuary of man's being, and it serves in no small degree to mirror to him the spiritual verities with which it is his high privilege to be conversant. But has not Rousseau exalted overmuch the function of mere sentiment, or unreasoned emotion? For our part, we do not hesitate to answer that some of his utterances savor of a misleading extreme. No doubt it may be urged that he is in orthodox company. It often happens that the pulpit responds to the strictures of rationalism with an appeal to sentiment very

much in the style of Rousseau. It is well that the appeal should be made; but let the due restriction be applied. Sentiment must have a framework of rationality to grow upon, if it is to rise in beauty and healthfulness. Let go the demand for industrious thoughtfulness and genuine rationality, and there is no telling what superstitions will invade the religious realm, what vagaries, what puerilities, what fooleries with relics and the like, what grievous list of mere doll-baby attachments. As religion is properly the function of the whole man, so the safeguard of its purity lies in the exercise of all the faculties. In the right synthesis of history, reason, and emotion is provided the basis of a normal and healthy religious life.

Rousseau's sentimental deism, or semi-scepticism, may be regarded as the concluding phase of French free-thinking in the eighteenth century. The vulgar atheism which cropped out at the crisis of the Revolution was rather a phase of frenzy than of any kind of thinking.

To arrest an advancing scepticism, like that which has been described, was obviously no easy task. Its insinuating methods and unfixed character embarrassed the effort to bring it to close quarters. Even with the best management a speedy victory was not likely to be forthcoming. But the actual management of the subject was far from being well chosen and efficient. The feeble and inconsequent efforts of the authorities to suppress the offending writings sufficed for little else than to irritate the sceptics, and to inflame their zeal. While the appeal to force and authority was thus abor-

tive, there was at the same time a dearth of fresh and effective argumentation. "Most of the replies were not above the rank of indigested balderdash."[1] Orthodox intellect seemed to have become a missing article in France. A few writers, however, showed that complete sterility had not been reached. Duguet used his pen to good advantage in his "Traité des Principes de la Foi Chrétienne." But the most trenchant apology was written by Antoine Guenée, under the title "Lettres de quelques Juifs, Portugais, Allemands, et Polonais à M. de Voltaire." We know from the words of Voltaire himself that he was touched to the quick by Guenée's criticism, at once polite and deft.

III. — THE FRENCH CHURCH PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION.

In the treatment of the preceding topics the general course of events belonging to the present subject has necessarily been anticipated. There are some special points, however, which may be accorded a brief attention, such as the extent of the protest against the bull Unigenitus; the amount of papal sanction given to the bull; the relation of the controversy to the insinuation of Ultramontanism; the crowning scandal of the controversy effected by imposing the bull upon the consciences of penitents as a condition of absolution; the closing stage of Jansenism; the downfall of the Jesuits; and the fortunes of Protestants.

Mention has been made of the fact that the majority of the bishops adhered to the bull Unigenitus. This

[1] De Pressensé, L'Église et la Révolution Française, p. 14.

adhesion was not the result of any fervent affection for that document. Some of them, doubtless, sharing the animosity of those who instigated the Pope to issue the bull, approved it as a means of annihilating the Jansenist party. A larger number probably were influenced by their double dependence upon King and Pope. They had learned that it was not easy to resist the will of Louis XIV., even when he was acting counter to Rome. In the Unigenitus affair they saw that King and Pope were united. Deeming it, therefore, hazardous to resist, and not being seriously troubled with theological convictions, they subscribed. The ensuing death of Louis gave, it is true, a temporary release from royal pressure; but to retract was a humiliating step, and also of doubtful prudence, since it would expose them to the Pope's displeasure, and would be very embarrassing in case the papal constitution should finally be sustained.

The position of the majority in the episcopate was too well explained to be of much weight with those whose independence was less hampered. In fact the protesting party greatly exceeded that of the subscribers. Voltaire, who had reached the verge of manhood at the publication of the constitution Unigenitus, thus describes the relative strength of the two parties, as the matter stood a few years later: "The Church of France continued to be divided into two parties, the *accepters* and the *rejecters*. The accepters were the hundred bishops who had adhered under Louis XIV. with the Jesuits and the Capuchins. The rejecters were fifteen bishops and the whole nation. The accepters enjoyed the support of Rome; the other party that of the uni-

versities, the parliaments and the people."[1] Nearly a score of years were requisite to overcome the opposition so far as to secure a nominal assent to the detested constitution. It was only after forty-eight doctors had been expelled that the Sorbonne was constrained to subscribe in an unqualified manner (1729). As for the Parliament of Paris, it gave no voluntary assent, and the registration of the declaration for the execution of the constitution could be obtained only through the arbitrary mandate of the King (1730). Before reaching this result the government had signalized its inflexible resolution by afflicting numbers of the protesting clergy with fines, banishment, or imprisonment. The amount of violence used did not tend to increase the impression of the people respecting the holiness of the papal constitution. It was also a dubious element in the case that the infamous Dubois had been the means of turning the scale in favor of subscription at a crucial point in the controversy, and had been rewarded with a cardinal's hat.

It has been thought that Clement XI. doubted the wisdom of sending forth the bull which was to give him such an unenviable notoriety, and yielded with a measure of reluctance to the pressure of intemperate partisans. However this may have been, both he and the succeeding Popes made no concessions to the appeals with which they were assailed. Near the end of 1716 he issued briefs to various parties in France, wherein he insisted upon unqualified subscription and declared that to demand explanations of the bull was "to hanker after the fruit of the forbidden tree." Two

[1] Siècle de Louis XIV., chap. xxxvii., edit. 1829–40.

years later, in a communication addressed to all Christians, he pronounced all who had refused or should refuse obedience to the bull contumacious, and sundered from communion with the apostolic see until they should thoroughly repent of their fault.[1] Innocent XIII. approved the position of his predecessor, declaring in letters to the King and the Regent that the bull Unigenitus condemned nothing but manifest errors. Benedict XIII., notwithstanding his anti-Molinist views in theology, commanded the strict observance of the bull (1725). Finally Benedict XIV., in a brief, or encyclical letter, of the year 1756, gave this unmistakable decision: "Such is the authority of the constitution Unigenitus that no faithful Christian can refuse to submit to it, or oppose it in any way whatever, but at the risk of his eternal salvation."[2] That the several Popes who had occasion to render a verdict upon the subject should have taken this ground is entirely explicable. They could not have done otherwise without exposing papal authority to the disgrace of a most glaring contradiction. For the constitution was from the start as plainly an *ex cathedra* document as it was possible for a pope to construct. It assumed to bind every member of the Roman Catholic Church, not to think, teach, or preach, any of the condemned propositions.[3] To re-

[1] Magnum Bullarium Romanum, Continuatio, Pars ii. pp. 205–207.

[2] Jervis, History of the Church of France, ii. 322.

[3] Omnes et singulas propositiones præinsertas, tanquam falsas, captiosas, etc., hac nostra perpetuò valitura constitutione declaramus, damnamus, et reprobamus; mandantes omnibus utriusque sexus Christifidelibus, ne de dictis propositionibus sentire, docere, ac prædicare aliter præsumant, quàm in hac eadem nostra constitutione continetur; ita ut quicumque illas, vel illarum aliquam conjunctim, vel divisim docuerit,

tract was out of the question on the part of those who had no higher interest than their own absolute authority. To explain was nearly equally out of the question. The bull had been issued, not against abstract propositions, but against sentences contained in a specific work. Some of these sentences were as clearly expressive of a definite idea as it was possible for language to frame. To allow, therefore, that they were not condemned in their apparent sense would be equivalent to allowing that they were not condemned at all, and so would expose the Pope to the charge of folly or malice in having sought to discredit the writing of an eminent author by marshalling against it an extended line of bugbears.

The circumstances and the issue of the strife involved a partial victory for Ultramontanism. The Gallican sentiment, cherished by a large part of the nation, was indeed far from being quenched. On the contrary, it was kindled in many minds to an intensity which threatened to burn away all real bonds of connection with Rome. But the exigencies of controversy naturally led the supporters of the papal constitution in the reverse direction. In their attempts to silence opponents they were in a manner driven to magnify the authority of the Pope, and the duty of unqualified obedience. The position taken by the majority of the bishops constrained them for the time practically to ignore, if not formally to deny, the principles of Galli-

defenderit, ediderit, aut de eis, etiam disputativè, publicè, aut privatim tractaverit, nisi forsan impugnando, ecclesiasticis censuris, aliisque contra similia perpetrantes a jure statutis pœnis ipso facto absque alia declaratione subjaceat.

canism. Some of them indulged in statements of a decidedly ultra cast. Early in the strife the Archbishop of Arles made bold to declare that the opposers of the bull were more guilty than Adam was after the primal trespass. Various writings began to be circulated which advocated the infallibility of the Pope. In one of these the author was pleased to say that it was not less heretical to reject the bull Unigenitus than to deny the incarnation of the Word and the divinity of Jesus Christ.[1]

Whatever degree of assent the bishops may have given to formal statements of this class, some of them proceeded at length to act as if they were undoubtedly true. In 1749 and the following years a scheme was set on foot to honor the Unigenitus constitution by making it a kind of indispensable passport into paradise. In pursuance of this purpose, De Beaumont, Archbishop of Paris, issued the requisition that applicants for sacraments — at least in cases where there was any doubt about their frame of mind — should be required to produce "billets de confession," or certificates signed by orthodox priests, and testifying that the bearers cordially accepted the bull Unigenitus. This requisition was copied in nearly all the dioceses. The result was that some of the most conscientious men in the realm were denied the sacraments in the dying hour, and were left to expire without a title to Christian burial. Great wrath was naturally provoked; but it was a number of years before the tyrannous requisition was abandoned. The disreputable game of

[1] Rocquain, L'Esprit Révolutionnaire avant la Révolution, pp. 8, 17, 36.

the "billets de confession" may well be characterized as a fitting conclusion to a peculiarly disgraceful chapter in religious history. In truth, the atheistic revel of the revolutionary era was scarcely more of a sacrilege against Christianity than was the whole ungodly fracas of which the bull Unigenitus was the central and the most responsible factor.

It may have been noticed that little mention has been made of the Jansenists in the above account. The reason has been that in the great party opposed to the papal constitution the Jansenists proper were not the most considerable fraction. Their Augustinian theology had never been acceptable to the larger portion of the French people. In the later stages of their history they had no great writers to recommend their theology, no names comparable with those which had adorned their early annals. Moreover, an unhappy episode inflicted much damage upon their reputation. As in previous times the zeal of rival parties in the Church had created a fruitful demand for miracles, so it was in case of the Jansenists. During the dark days when the unholy fiat which Jesuit malice had obtained from Rome was being made effectual against their adherents, their excited feelings were ready to claim relief in any appearance of supernatural intervention. The first token which met their watchful eyes was in 1725. A woman claimed to have been miraculously healed while accompanying a procession in which a priest who belonged to the appellant or protesting party was carrying the consecrated host. The Jansenists made much of the event; but soon it became unnecessary for them to dwell upon this single instance. In 1729 and

the following years miracles in their behalf were, so to speak, an every-day occurrence. These were connected primarily with the grave of a Jansenist ascetic, François Pâris, in the cemetery of Saint Médard. It was claimed that sick people who visited this grave were supernaturally cured of their maladies. Extraordinary symptoms were sometimes manifested by the patients, such as convulsions, prophesyings, and trances. The like phenomena still appeared in other quarters after access to the wonder-working grave had been prevented by the authorities. Excessive enthusiasm ran into a crude physical rôle, which justified the name *convulsionnaires* that was applied to the subjects of this overpowering excitement. At length the sober-minded among the Jansenists themselves were revolted, and constrained to censure the strange proceedings of their brethren as unworthy of religion.

It is needless to say that these miracles, especially when their credit was at its height, were not pleasing to the foes of Jansenism. As Roman Catholics, they were ready to welcome any quantity of prodigies, provided they should be rightly placed; but to have miracles at a Jansenist tomb was simply intolerable. The Jesuits in particular were cut to the heart. The glory of their order, it is true, was sustained by a record of all sorts of prodigies. But most of these occurred afar off, beyond the dim outlines of distant continents. An objector had a chance to say that the wonderful stories which were told had grown in the process of transmission. But here were miracles wrought beneath the eyes of critical Paris, miracles every way as well attested as any which had happened at the shrine of

Becket. In their distress they could think of no safer expedient than to give the credit of the whole business to the devil. Not denying the strange workings of a mysterious power, they classed them among lying wonders. This was the position taken by one of their number in a writing published in 1737, under the title "Traité dogmatique sur les faux miracles du temps." Many others coincided with the Jesuits in this interpretation. Indeed the writer of the above treatise might have quoted Pope Clement XII., as well as the Archbishop of Paris, in support of the view that the Jansenist miracles were wrought by the favor of the Arch Deceiver. In the final result, while the Jansenists suffered discredit, their opponents also made but doubtful gains. The main advantage accrued to those who had no special love for either party, — to the school of free-thinkers.[1]

Before leaving the Jansenists, we may add a word respecting that memorial of their struggle which has been perpetuated in the Netherlands. In the time of persecution various representatives of their party had found a refuge in this region. Here the resident Roman Catholics awarded them so much sympathy as to fall themselves under suspicion and accusation. Adverse reports were carried to Rome, and the Pope was constrained in 1704 to depose the Archbishop of Utrecht. This measure, instead of subduing the minds of the people served to make them all the more friendly

[1] Barbier, Journal Historique du Règne de Louis XV., années 1729–1732; Grégoire, Histoire des Sectes Religieuses, tome ii. chap. 13; Martin, Histoire de France, tome xv.; Bauer, Kirchengeschichte der Neueren Zeit, pp. 513–518; Jervis, Church of France, ii. 281–287.

to the Jansenist interest. Finally, inasmuch as the Pope would not recognize the newly elected archbishop, it was decided in 1723 to install him without waiting longer for the papal authorization. From this date the succession has been continued in the episcopal see of Utrecht. At each new election of a bishop request is made of the Pope for confirmation. This is always refused, and so communion with Rome, though not repudiated in principle, is continually postponed.

About the time that the epidemic enthusiasm which spread from the grave of François Pâris was bringing discredit upon the Jansenist cause, the populace found occasion for irreverent witticisms in a book by the Bishop of Soissons, which was devoted to the memory of Marie Alacoque.[1] The book was a tribute to a form of religious distemper less violent than that of the *convulsionnaires*, but not many degrees superior in the sight of rational piety. This Marie Alacoque, whose story the bishop recounted, was supposed, near the end of the preceding century, to have been favored with the sight of the heart of Jesus in his opened breast. Stimulated by this fanciful vision, the mediæval faculty for materializing everything, which enters into the essence of the Romish Church, went to work to organize a specific devotion of the Sacred Heart. The Jesuits patronized the new auxiliary to a sentimental and superstitious worship. It did not, however, make great progress till the latter part of the century, when Clement XIII.

[1] Barbier, Journal, i. 307, 308; Grégoire, Histoire des Sectes Religieuses, tome ii. chap. 20; Rocquain, L'Esprit Révolutionnaire avant la Révolution, pp. 80, 81.

gave it his approval.[1] A special devotion to the heart of Jesus fostered inevitably a parallel honor to Mary, and there are some indications that the latter was rendered in no grudging measure. One of the fervent writers of the time speaks of the heart of Mary as "the storehouse of divine compassions, the furnace of the celestial fire, the library of the Old and of the New Testament."[2] Another peculiar form of devotion prevailed for a season, at least within a limited circle. As D'Argenson, writing in 1751, informs us, the Queen and a number of the court ladies made use of skulls as an aid to their piety. "They adorn," he says, "these heads of the dead with ribbons and pendants; or they illuminate them with lamps, and they meditate before them for a half-hour."[3]

It is supposed that Clement XIII. had some reference to the existing needs of the Jesuits, for whom he had large sympathy, when he approved the devotion to the Sacred Heart, designing to supply thereby a means of encouragement and union to the members of the Order, and those who shared in their griefs. There was certainly occasion enough for any encouragement that the friendly Pontiff had to offer. The time of reckoning had come for the disciples of Loyola.

The conduct of the Jesuits just before the storm burst upon them cannot be said to have been specially odious. They had not been unusually aggressive and intriguing. The storm was not the offspring of fresh provocation;

[1] A question soon arose as to whether the Pope had approved devotion to anything more than the symbolical heart, as distinguished from the physical organ.

[2] Grégoire, Histoire des Sectes, tome ii. chap. 20.

[3] Mémoires, vii. 16, 17.

it was rather the accumulated retribution which the misconduct of generations had earned. There may have been indeed some special provocations at this juncture. But these did not necessarily affect the standing of the whole Order. Had there not been a foregoing history, begetting in many minds the conviction that incorrigible evil was ingrained into this society, it might have successfully met any temporary causes of objection and ill-will.

A Jesuit writer has expressed surprise that it was precisely in Portugal, where the Jesuits seemed to be so firmly intrenched, that the great attack upon them was begun. "At the court," he says, "they were not only the guides of the consciences and conduct of the royal princes and princesses, but also were made the advisers of the King and his ministers in the most important matters. No position in the administration of the State or the Church was awarded without their consent and their influence, so that in truth the higher clergy, the nobles, and the people vied with each other to obtain their intercession and favor."[1] These words used in justification of surprise might better be employed for a contrary purpose. The overgrown influence of the Jesuits in Portugal is by itself a large part of the explanation of the attack upon them. To a statesman like Pombal, confident, energetic, and aggressive, it seemed a thing intolerable that a parcel of ecclesiastics should so completely dominate the nation. Having once entered upon the task of reducing their influence, he doubtless found that either he or they

[1] Georgel, quoted by Theiner, Geschichte des Pontificats Clemens XIV. i. 5.

would have to go under. He therefore utilized to the full whatever might be turned to the discredit of the Jesuit fathers. He found in their mercantile projects a cause for complaint. Their alleged complicity in the armed rebellion of the natives in Paraguay gave him a vantage ground against them. Still more their alleged complicity in an attempt to assassinate the King (1758) gave him a formidable advantage. In 1759 came the unsparing edict for their banishment. They were sent in a body to their spiritual father, the Pope.

The news from Portugal caused a profound sensation in France, and in all likelihood raised the question in many minds whether the example of the sister realm might not be successfully imitated. As it happened, there was no occasion to harbor this inquiry for a long time. The impolicy of the Jesuits themselves placed effective weapons in the hands of their opponents. One of the fathers of the Order, Antoine Lavalette, who resided in Martinique, had engaged in large mercantile enterprises. The capture of several of his ships entailed so great a loss on the French firms with which he was financially connected that they were compelled to go into bankruptcy. The creditors of the bankrupt merchants then sued Lavalette and his immediate superior. It being hopeless to secure from them the large sum that was owed, they next tried the expedient of making the Order itself, as a corporate body in the realm, responsible. The Marseilles tribunal agreed to their plea. But the Jesuits were not convinced. Being advised that their establishments had no such oneness in law that all could be held to account for the liabilities of each, they concluded that they would try

a legal shift rather than pay the money. With strange fatuity they submitted their case to the Parliament of Paris, the very body which had long and fiercely contended against their schemes. In answer to the claim that the Order could not be held responsible for the debt of a member, the Parliament asked for their constitution. This document, till then unknown to the public, was produced. It is needless to say that it made no favorable impression upon the minds of zealous Gallicans. Those who insisted that the State could not endure the unlimited authority claimed by the foreign ecclesiastic dwelling in the Vatican, were naturally jealous of an institute which delivered a powerful company of men within the realm, body and soul, to a foreign head. The determination of Parliament mounted at once beyond the affair of Lavalette. The examination of the books of casuistry which followed was rather a means of justifying its resolution to overthrow the Society than a basis of judgment.

An attempt was made to save the Jesuits by a compromise measure, providing that certain restrictions agreeable to Gallicanism should be accepted by the Order. A scheme of this kind, indorsed by the King, was forwarded to Rome. The response was a rejection of the proposal, uttered either by the Pope or the General, in these unequivocal words: "Sint ut sunt, aut non sint," — "Let them be as they are, or let them cease to be." Public opinion in France dictated the latter alternative. The royal order for the suppression of the Society was issued in November, 1764. This did not prohibit the residence of former members in France. But sentence of banishment was near at hand; it fell upon them in 1767.

Clement XIII. was profoundly disturbed by the overthrow of the Jesuits in France. As a means of censuring past and checking future assaults he issued the bull Apostolicum (January, 1765). This is nothing less than a warm commendation of the Order, wherein the Pope pronounces the charges made against its principles to be malicious and unfounded, and repels them in these terms: "We publish and declare that the Institute of the Society of Jesus savors in the highest degree of piety and sanctity both on account of the high end which it specially contemplates, namely, the defence and propagation of the Catholic religion, and also on account of the means which it applies to the attainment of this end."[1]

This commendation was vain. The nations did not consider it necessary to ask the Pope what they should think of the Jesuits. Against the tempest which had begun to blow, the apostolic voice was no better than common breath.

The next and most far-reaching visitation upon the doomed Order was in the Spanish dominions, European and American. The decree of banishment was issued in 1767. An insurrection of the preceding year is presumed to have afforded the pretext. Beyond this all is involved in obscurity. There was no public process, and the King did not deign to assign a single specific reason for his summary measure. The following announcement to the Pope gives his motive for this secrecy: "To spare the world a great scandal, I will keep forever in my own heart the abominable plot which has necessitated these rigors. Your Holiness

[1] Bullarii Romani Continuatio, Clemens XIII., iii. 38, 39.

should believe me upon my word. The safety of my life demands of me a profound silence in this matter."[1]

The kingdom of Naples and Sicily was made forbidden ground to the Jesuits (1767), as also the duchy of Parma (1768). In connection with the latter, Clement XIII. conceived that a suitable occasion had been given for the manifestation of his displeasure, some steps adverse to papal control having been added to the unkind treatment of his favorites. Reviving an old claim that this territory was a fief of the papacy, he undertook to treat the Duke of Parma as a rebellious vassal, and launched against him a sentence of excommunication. The boldness of the act was its only recommendation. The duke was related to the sovereigns of Spain, France, and Naples. Resenting the papal onslaught as an insult to the Bourbon family, they made reprisals by seizing papal territory. Nor was this all; they laid a formal demand upon the Pontiff to wholly abolish the Order of Jesuits. Whether Clement XIII. would have resisted this formidable combination was not to be made manifest. His death in 1769 transferred the fate of the Order to the hands of his successor.

Clement XIV. came to the papal throne, if not under an implicit engagement to fulfil the demand of the sovereigns, with far less of disinclination to do so than was cherished by the preceding Pope. Amiable and moderate in disposition, he was ready to study the interests of peace. As the Bourbon governments continued to press their demand, that of Spain being especially energetic and pertinacious, he at length gave

[1] Crétineau-Joly, Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus, v. 302.

them satisfaction. The brief for the dissolution of the Order of Jesuits was issued in 1773. In this writing, after taking note of precedents for dissolving orders, and calling attention to the numerous dissensions of which the Jesuits had been the occasion, and which it seemed impossible to prevent or allay, the Pope thus pronounced his decision: "Actuated by so many and important considerations, and, as we hope, aided by the presence and inspiration of the Holy Spirit, compelled besides by the necessity of our ministry, which strictly obliges us to conciliate, maintain, and confirm the peace and tranquillity of the Christian republic, and remove every obstacle which may tend to trouble it; having further considered that the said Company of Jesus can no longer produce those abundant fruits and those great advantages with a view to which it was instituted, approved by so many of our predecessors, and endowed with so many and extensive privileges; that on the contrary, it was very difficult not to say impossible, that the Church could recover a firm and durable peace so long as the said Society subsisted; in consequence hereof, and determined by the particular reasons we have alleged, and forced by other motives which prudence and the good government of the Church have dictated, the knowledge of which we reserve to ourselves . . . we suppress and abolish the said Company."

Clement XIV. died the next year. His sickness was such as to lead some nearest to his person to believe that he had been poisoned. The question as to who administered the poison — supposing death to have been effected by that cause — lies too purely in the region of speculation to be considered here.

Cast out of their own household the Jesuits found refuge with the heretic and the schismatic. Doubtless it was not for the purpose of heaping coals of fire on their heads in the apostolic sense that Frederic II. of Prussia and the Russian Empress Catharine II. gave friendly entertainment to the members of the proscribed Order. Frederic had recently acquired territories largely Roman Catholic in population. He had promised to allow these territories to remain *in statu quo* as respects religion. The resident Jesuits were acceptable to the people. They were also largely employed as teachers, and it would make some trouble to supply their places. He therefore concluded to let them rest in peace. In communicating with the Pope upon the subject, he mischievously suggested that, inasmuch as he was a heretic, his Holiness was not able to release him from his obligation to keep his word, or from the duty of being an honest man.[1] The motives of Catharine were very much the same as those of Frederic. She thought that she could safely use the Jesuits in the recently acquired Polish territory. Here they were allowed to receive novices. In fact Russian patronage served in a special sense to carry the Order through the period of legal nonentity.

It is interesting to note that adversity brought some dogmatic ameliorations to the minds of the Jesuits. As they were awaiting their fate in France a streak of genuine Gallican light shot across the leaden sky of their Ultramontanism. The illumination was sudden, and doubtless was not very permanent. But while it lasted, it had its effect. One hundred and sixteen

[1] Crétineau-Joly, v. 465.

fathers, including provincials and superiors, gave their written assent to the strong Gallican articles of the Assembly of 1682.[1] A few years later some of their brethren in Germany were favored with a similar illumination, in virtue of which they gave their support to theses utterly irreconcilable with Ultramontane maxims.[2]

The interior broils of the French Church were not so engrossing in this period as to withdraw attention entirely from the duty of vexing the Protestants. There were intervals indeed during which they received a measure of indulgence. Some of the harsher provisions against them were left very largely in abeyance during the regency of the Duke of Orleans. But a bitter atonement was usually exacted for such a season of relative quiet. To permit the harvest to grow was to create an extra demand for the use of the scythe. So we find the government issuing in 1724 a peculiarly cruel edict. "To the penalty of death decreed against preachers was added the galleys for life for men, and perpetual imprisonment for women, against all who did not inform against them. It was enjoined on curés, or vicars, to visit the sick suspected of heresy, and to exhort them in private and without witnesses. An arbitrary fine was decreed against relatives, friends, or servants, who should prevent the curé from having access to the sick, and the galleys for life against concealed Protestants who should exhort or assist the sick

[1] Crétineau-Joly, v. 260, 261; Theiner, Geschichte des Pontificats Clemens XIV., i. 21–23.

[2] Theiner, ii. 490, 491.

secretly. The law condemning every Protestant, who should be cured after having refused the sacraments, to the galleys for life, and to confiscation of property as a backslider, was confirmed; if the sick man died his memory was to be prosecuted, and his property confiscated. Formerly it was necessary that the refusal of the sacraments should be attested by a magistrate; now the testimony of the curé was sufficient. The parish priest was constituted an official informer. Parents were forbidden to consent to the marriage of their children in foreign countries, without express permission from the King, under penalty of the galleys for life for men, and perpetual banishment for women, with confiscation of property. At the same time the *new Catholics* (and under this title were comprehended all Protestants, according to the fiction of the law of 1715, which denied that there were any Protestants remaining in France) were ordered to observe in their marriages the formalities prescribed by the *holy canons* and the ordinances. All civil status was thus annihilated for Protestants; there were thenceforth in France, before the law, only Catholics, and backsliders liable to the galleys." [1] An equally unsparing edict was issued in 1745.

While the practice was not perseveringly kept on a level with this barbarous code, there were numerous instances of intolerable vexation. Now and then a preacher was visited with a capital sentence. Bénezet was hanged in 1752, Lafage in 1754, Rochette in 1762.

It was first in 1788, on the eve of the Revolution, that a scant measure of legal toleration was granted to

[1] Henri Martin, Histoire de France, tome xv., pp. 118, 119, in Eng. translation.

the Protestants. Even then the concession provoked the protest of the clergy. It required a very special tuition to instil into them the lesson of tolerance. The Faculty of Theology in Paris had not yet learned the alphabet of the subject in 1766. In their censure of a work published in that year they declared that religious intolerance was an essential principle of Catholicism.[1] "The Assemblies of the clergy held from the accession of Louis XVI. up to the Revolution continually complained of the attempts of the Protestants to secure liberty of conscience. The following words appear in the report of the Abbé de la Rochefoucauld presented in 1789: 'This sect, which in the midst of its ruins retains the audacious and independent spirit which it had from its origin, wishes to usurp for falsehood the rights which belong only to the truth.' "[2]

IV. — THE FRENCH CHURCH IN THE REVOLUTIONARY ERA.

As the States-General were convened in 1789, it was expected that the reforms to be accomplished would touch the Church in some measure. Among the clergy, however, there were only a few who contemplated extensive changes. The great majority thought to stop short with the amendment of the most notorious abuses, conserving to the Church meanwhile its system of revenue and its organization comparatively intact.

Among the causes which defeated this conservative intent was a dissidence in the ranks of the clergy them-

[1] Rocquain, Esprit révolutionnaire avant la Révolution, p. 262.

[2] De Pressensé, L'Église et la Révolution Française, p. 23.

selves. A division of feeling prevented concert of action between the higher and the lower ecclesiastics. An enormous grievance had weighed upon the latter for a long time. No appreciable part had been accorded to them in the counsels of the Church. While abbots who lived in secular ease, and bishops who were not over-zealous in spiritual tasks, enjoyed magnificent revenues, the curés, who with their vicars did the substantial work in the thirty-five thousand parishes of the realm, received but a pittance. The inequality was glaring; and the curés had begun to see it with open eyes. In a memorial which they presented to the throne at the time of the elections to the States-General, they expressed in emphatic terms their sense of the injury which they were enduring. In a great number of pamphlets also, issued at the end of 1788 and the beginning of 1789, they denounced the insufficiency of their allowances, the excessive opulence of the bishops, and the scandalous luxury of the abbots.[1] When, therefore, the Constituent Assembly began its work, the curés naturally regarded with leniency measures which promised to improve their condition, and in order to enforce their claims were ready to yield a degree of support to the projects of their lay associates. This produced in the latter a species of illusion. From the liberal attitude of the curés they drew a mistaken inference as to the amount of ecclesiastical reconstruction which might be attempted without provoking perilous antagonisms in the State. Before the first representative assembly of the revolutionary era had closed its sessions, an ecclesiastical scheme had

[1] Jean Wallon, Le Clergé de 1789, pp. 176–179.

been promulgated which drove into a hostile attitude a large proportion of the curés, as well as the whole body of the higher clergy, a few individuals only excepted.

In approaching this result the Constituent Assembly passed three different classes of measures. The first assailed the old system of ecclesiastical revenue. By a rapid movement, starting from the abolition of tithes, the control of its property was taken away from the Church, and a considerable portion of its estates were placed on sale to meet the pressing needs of the nation. In close connection with this movement, — indeed, a part of it in one aspect of the subject, — the legal existence of monastic orders was declared at an end. A decree which was passed in February, 1790, contained these provisions: (1) "The National Assembly decrees that the law will not henceforth recognize solemn monastic vows, either of one sex or the other; and declares, in consequence, that the orders in which such vows are made are and will remain suppressed in France, and that none such can be established for the future. (2) All inmates of religious houses may quit them on making a declaration to the local municipal officers; and a suitable pension will be immediately provided for them. Certain houses will be assigned for the residence of those who may not wish to take advantage of the present decree. No changes will be made with regard to houses which are devoted to public education and works of charity, until the Assembly shall determine otherwise. (3) Female communities are expressly exempted from the article which ordains that several religious houses shall be amalgamated into one." [1]

[1] Jervis, The Gallican Church and the Revolution, pp. 46, 47.

These measures, radical as they were, could plead some weighty facts for their justification. An abuse of religious feeling and ecclesiastical privilege had led to an abnormal engrossment of Church property. "The clergy had immense landed estates, yielding an annual revenue of eighty millions. They possessed in the greater part of France from a quarter to a third of the soil, the half in certain regions, as in Franche-Comté, Roussillon, and Alsace, and much more than a half in Hainaut and Artois; almost the entire district of Cambray belonged to them."[1] In not a few instances the monastic institute had become anything but an illustration of poverty and devotion. Many of the houses with which large revenues were connected included but a handful of monks. Of fifty-seven establishments of canons regular in Dauphiny and the South the majority embraced but two or three members, while eleven of them counted each seven members, and only one had so high a number as twelve.[2] Such things undoubtedly called for a remedy. Still the action of the Assembly in relation to Church property and the monastic institute had in it no small element of revolutionary violence and arbitrariness. It was a kind of surgery which is justifiable, if at all, only on the score of extreme danger.

The third class of measures had no such doubtful characteristics, being only a sane advance toward the principles of religious tolerance. The first step was taken in August, 1789, when the following article was adopted as a part of the Declaration of Rights: "No

[1] Henri Martin, Histoire de France depuis 1789, tome i. p. 100.

[2] Jean Wallon, Le Clergé de 1789, pp. 80, 81.

one ought to be disquieted for his opinions, even on religion, provided their manifestation does not disturb the public order established by law." This was only a partial platform of religious freedom, such as Montesquieu and Rousseau had sanctioned. While it bespoke liberty of opinion, it did not distinctly guarantee liberty of worship, or the civil equality of those adhering to a dissenting form. This defect was noticed at the time. Mirabeau, in particular, called for a more generous position. "Liberty the most boundless in religion," exclaimed the great orator, "is in my eyes a right so sacred that even the word *toleration*, by which it is sought to explain it, seems to me in some sort tyrannical. The existence of an authority which can grant toleration infringes freedom by the very fact of tolerating; for this implies that it might refuse to tolerate."[1] As the Assembly moved rapidly in any direction which was once chosen, it took but a few months to reach a broader platform than that contained in the Declaration of Rights. Already in December, 1789, non-Catholics were declared eligible to all employments, civil and military.

While the Assembly was thus establishing on the one hand maxims of religious freedom, it was laying on the other a foundation for coercion and oppression in the sphere of religious practice and conviction. This grew out of the entanglements of Church and State. Instead of following the way out of difficulty which the government of the United States of America had just adopted, in that it recognized no established religion, and relegated the Church to the position of a purely

[1] The Gallican Church and the Revolution, p. 27.

voluntary association, the French legislature, choosing a course not a little agreeable to Gallican traditions, undertook to make Church affairs simply a department of the national administration. The "Civil Constitution of the Clergy," which was ordained in July, 1790, meant nothing less than this. It was a thorough piece of Erastianism. Without previous agreement with any assembly representing the Church, the State undertook herein to revolutionize the ecclesiastical geography of France, to establish new methods of appointment to clerical offices, and to apply a new scale of prerogatives to the different ranks of the hierarchy. The following articles of the new constitution may be taken in illustration: —

"Each department shall form a single diocese, and each diocese shall have the same extent and the same limits as the department."

"The vicars of the cathedral churches, the vicars superior, and those acting as directors of the seminary [of the diocese] shall form together the customary and permanent council of the bishop, who shall not be qualified to perform any act of jurisdiction in that which concerns the government of the diocese and the seminary, until after he has deliberated with them; nevertheless, the bishop shall be authorized to issue alone in the course of his visits such provisional ordinances as may appertain to his office."

"Reckoning from the day of the publication of the present decree, only one basis of incumbency in the bishoprics and cures shall be recognized, namely, that of election."

"All the elections shall take place by way of ballot, and an absolute plurality shall determine the choice."

"The bishop from whom confirmation may be asked shall not require nor be able to exact any oath from the candidate elect except his acknowledgment that he holds the Catholic, apostolic, and Roman religion."

"The new bishop shall not be able to address the Pope for any confirmation; but he shall write to him as the visible head of the Church universal, in testimony of the unity of faith and of the communion which is to be maintained with him."

"Before the ceremony of consecration commences, the candidate elect shall take, in the presence of the municipal officers, of the people, and of the clergy, the solemn oath to watch carefully over the faithful of the diocese committed to him, to be faithful to the nation, to the law, and to the King, and to maintain with all his power the constitution decreed by the National Assembly and accepted by the King."

"The bishoprics and the cures shall be reputed empty until the elected candidates have taken the above-mentioned oaths." [1]

In the light of these and similar articles it is manifest that the constitution published by the Assembly left only a nominal connection with the papacy, and that it modified, moreover, the episcopal system in the realm by a strong infusion of presbyterianism. A hearty and general assent to so great and so sudden a change would have implied a miraculous triumph over conservative instincts.

The miracle did not occur. It was soon discovered by the Assembly that some of the clergy were showing

[1] Theiner, Documents Inédits relatifs aux Affaires Religieuses de la France, 1790 à 1800.

scant respect to its scheme. Heated discussion followed. The outcome was the imposition of an oath, involving acceptance of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, not only as a condition of being installed in new positions, but also of retaining those already held. An attempt to press this demand immediately precipitated a schism. During the next few years French ecclesiastical history flowed in three main currents. There were the "non-jurors," or the clergy who refused the oath; the "constitutional clergy," or those who accepted the government scheme; and finally the representatives of that intolerant infidelity which swept like a flood over France, threatening ruin to all stanch upholders of positive Christianity, whether of the non-juring or of the constitutional party. A few words may properly be added respecting each of these classes.

With the exception of four or five bishops, the non-jurors included the whole body of prelates in the realm who had been installed under the old régime. The same party included more than half of the ordinary priests. In many districts by far the larger part of the people were devoted to the non-juring clergy, and refused the ministrations of their rivals. Here was evidently a prophecy of mischief. So unmistakable were the omens that some of the most ardent friends of the Revolution were not able to repress their apprehensions of disaster. Mirabeau, among others, saw the political peril involved in the attempt to impose an ecclesiastical constitution upon a reluctant people. Speaking to Camus, who had taken a leading part in the innovating measures, he remarked: "Your detestable Constitution

of the Clergy will destroy the Constitution that we are making for ourselves."[1]

For a brief interval the non-juring clergy were treated with a measure of consideration. While their refusal of the oath deprived them of all governmental support, it was not understood to disqualify them from holding religious services. But with the advance of revolutionary fervor they were placed more and more beyond the pale of tolerance. Disturbances in various localities were interpreted to their disadvantage. The complicity of some of their number in attempts to raise a revolt tended to place the whole body under the ban. Before the end of 1791 decrees were passed which branded them as suspected persons, and provided that they should be placed under special surveillance. A decree of the following year left them exposed to constant danger of banishment, since a prescribed amount of accusation was all that the law required for sentence against them. Scores of them were massacred at Paris in response to the demand for a means of terrorism. This tragedy occurred in September, 1792. It seems to have been followed by no relenting. The decrees of the next year exposed the nonconforming clergy still more completely to the caprice and malice of their enemies. The only security for their lives was in exile.

In 1795 a relative divorce between Church and State was proclaimed. No body of priests was to be salaried by the government, and no compulsory rates were to be allowed. All parties were to elect and to support their own worship, subject to such restrictions as order and equality might render necessary. This arrangement

[1] Jervis, The Gallican Church and the Revolution, p. 136.

promised security to the non-juring clergy, and a considerable number of them made bold to resume their ministry. But the time of vexation had not yet fully passed away. The Directory was in large part unfavorable to positive Christianity, and took special pleasure in harassing the clergy of the old régime. An assured position was first reached under the patronage of Napoleon. Even then there were some drawbacks. No one could assure himself of tranquillity who was not willing to acquiesce in the will of the mighty dictator.

The manner in which the proscribed clergy bore the ordeal of persecution is worthy of much praise. Not a few of them endured their hard lot with equal fortitude and gentleness. It cannot be said, however, that all of them made a good use of the school of affliction. In too many cases the lesson of tolerance was imperfectly learned. At the height of the persecution against his brethren, Archbishop Maury thought it proper to justify the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and argued against conceding any legal ground to Protestantism in France.[1] Various of the exiled priests came back to nurse their grievances rather than to promote concord by a generous and self-forgetting policy. The constitutional clergy were treated by them as unworthy of fellowship. "In a number of instances," complains Grégoire, "they denied funeral honors to ecclesiastics who had taken the oath, while yet they accorded Christian funerals to the astronomer Lalande, a declared atheist, and to Volney, who died a decided sceptic."[2]

[1] Theiner, Documents Inédits, i. 395, 396.
[2] Mémoires, i. 307.

The mingled praise and blame which were earned by the non-juring clergy may also be awarded to the Pope whose fortune it was to rule in the time of disruption. Pius VI., while the principles of the papacy compelled him to reject the scheme of the revolutionary government in France, proceeded with creditable moderation. He took full time to deliberate before he censured the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. He viewed with as much calmness as could have been expected the storm which seemed to be driving the Church in France to utter wreck. When his own turn came to suffer humiliation and deprivation, when his temporal authority was taken away, and he was carried a prisoner into France (1798–99), at the instance of the Directory, he exhibited an exemplary patience and fortitude. But even in the person of Pius VI. the papacy must needs give a token of its hostility to modern progress. In a communication addressed to the French bishops, wherein he confirmed their opposition to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, Pius VI. explicitly repudiated the doctrine of religious tolerance, quoting as authority writings of Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, which legitimate coercion in behalf of religion. One in favor of capital inflictions could use the words of the Pope as justifying even that stretch of rigor against heretics, at least indirectly; for Aquinas, who is quoted approvingly on the general subject of enforcing adherence to the faith, teaches in the most unequivocal manner that Catholics who fall into stubborn heresy can justly be put to death.[1]

[1] Distinguishing between the obligations of those who, like the Jews, have never been counted as members of the Catholic Church, and the

The constitutional clergy, as being friendly to republicanism, were persecuted only in the ratio that the administration represented positive hostility to Christianity. Their position, however, was not enviable. They were under the censure of the Pope. Many of the people regarded them as interlopers. The spread of irreligion also narrowed the circle of those who gave any sympathetic response to their ministrations.

In their temper and ways of thinking this party gave some tokens of a greater freedom than could be expected of Roman Catholic ecclesiastics in general. They spoke freely of an interior reform of the Church, declared that one could be a good Catholic without the consent of the Pope, and were ready to allow that abundant sources of instruction, even on ecclesiastical themes, might be found outside of the Romish communion. The last point was enforced in a circular signed by the constitutional bishops. "It is perhaps necessary," they say, "to reproach various Catholic authors with having consulted too little the works of the learned nations which surround France. A multitude of profound writings almost unknown among us cast the greatest light upon points of dogma, upon dis-

subjects of Catholic baptism, the Pope says: Primi enim constringi ad catholicam obedientiam profitendam non debent; contra vero alteri sunt cogendi. Id quidem discrimen solidissimis, prout solet, rationibus exponit sanctus Thomas Aquinas, ac multis ante sæculis Tertullianus exposuit in libro Scorpiaci adv. gnosticos, et paucis ante annis Benedictus XIV., in opere de servorum Dei beatificatione, et beatorum canonizatione. Atque ut magis adhuc hujus argumenti pateat ratio, videndæ sunt duæ celeberrimæ sancti Augustini epistolæ, una ad Vincentium Cartennensem, altera ad Bonifacium comitem, per quas non veteres solum. sed et recentes hæretici plane refelluntur. (Theiner, Documents Inédits, i. 39.)

cipline, and upon ecclesiastical history. . . .We live no longer in those times when a thing was reputed bad simply because it had been announced by a Protestant; just as if the children of error could never be the organ of any truth; just as if an assertion were vitiated on other grounds than its opposition to the truth." [1]

The most striking figure among the constitutional clergy was undoubtedly Grégoire, Bishop of Blois. Active, courageous, outspoken, taking a leading part at the crisis of the Revolution, living through the whole of the Napoleonic era, and still possessing strength for extensive literary tasks after the return of the Bourbons, he embodied more features of interest than any other French ecclesiastic who wrought within the forty years which followed the assembling of the States-General. He may be ranked as the foremost apologist of the Revolution from the clergy. He deplored indeed its excesses, but he never ceased to be enamoured of the republican ideal which it had summoned forth. The usurping imperialism of Napoleon was to him an object of jealousy, if not of abhorrence. He himself offered no incense to the unscrupulous chief, and contemned the excessive adulation which others poured forth as savoring of blasphemy. In his views of the Church he remained the foe of Ultramontanism. The Roman court he defined as "the antipode of religion," and declared of the Inquisition that its existence was "an assault upon reason, a calumny against the Catholic Church." In harmony with this estimate of the Holy Office, he took an emphatic posi-

[1] Grégoire, Mémoires, Notice Historique par M. Carnot, pp. 105, 106.

tion on the side of tolerance, maintaining that the function of the civil power in relation to different religious societies may be expressed in these words: "To hinder any from troubling them, and them from troubling any."[1] In fine, he well earned the spite which the mention of his name still evokes from a genuine Ultramontanist.

An intolerant infidelity has been mentioned as affording the third current in the ecclesiastical movement of this era. At its worst this infidelity took the form of atheism. The crisis of the atheistic revel was near the close of 1793. "Reason" was its watchword; and in the name of reason it sought to uproot all historical religion. The opening fête of the new dispensation was celebrated in the cathedral of Notre Dame on the 10th of November, when a large throng paid homage to a woman who figured as the Goddess of Reason. Numerous other church edifices were turned into "temples of reason" by similar rites. Meanwhile a vastly greater amount of zeal and industry was expended in defaming the old faith than in defining the new. This *worship of reason*,— what did it mean? As Grégoire has remarked, its votaries would have been embarrassed by such a question. "Was it the eternal reason that they celebrated? That is God, of whom they wished to hear nothing. Was it the human reason? To worship that were idolatry."[2] It was very convenient to keep in the mist, and to make high-sounding words take the place of ideas.

Through contagion and terror the so-called worship

[1] Mémoires.

[2] Histoire des Sectes Religieuses, i. 40–50.

of reason acquired considerable currency, and a number of ecclesiastics became its professed adherents. But it had no firm hold upon the minds or hearts of the people. Robespierre did not misjudge when he concluded that it would be for his political advantage to head a reaction. Scarcely six months elapsed from the time of the profane pageant in the cathedral of Notre Dame before it was resolved to substitute the festival of the Supreme Being for that of reason. The decree which ushered in this stage of revolutionary religion was framed in terms like these: (1) "The French people recognizes the existence of the Supreme Being and the immortality of the soul; (2) it recognizes that the worship worthy of the Supreme Being is the practice of the duties of man: (3) it puts in the front rank of these duties detestation of bad faith and of tyranny, succoring of the unfortunate, defence of the oppressed, doing to others all the good one is able, and being unjust to no one."[1] A very good programme for an abstract religion! The fundamental trouble with it is that men are not abstract beings, and need for the satisfaction of imagination and feeling, and for stimulus to the will, such an assemblage of concrete representations as is given in a great and unique religious history.

The deistic scheme of Robespierre supplied the platform for a sect which survived the fervors of the Revolution for an interval. It was the design of the Theophilanthropists, whose regular organization dates from about 1797, to cultivate a philosophical religion, appropriating good maxims wherever they might find

[1] Grégoire, Histoire des Sectes, i. 101.

them, and serving in their collective capacity as "an institute of morals." Their ranks included some men of very respectable character; but the power to evoke devotion and consequent means of vitality and growth was not with them.

One of the most singular and persistent efforts of the government to proclaim a divorce from historical Christianity was in connection with the suppression of Sunday, and the consecration of each tenth day as the period of rest and religious service. This attempt was prosecuted till the end of the Directorate, and was the source of innumerable vexations. The Theophilanthropists had naturally, from their stand-point, no serious objection to the scheme of decades; but so uncongenial was it to all other classes of worshippers that a bare permission not to conform to it at once rendered it obsolete.

An innovation almost as great as the preceding, in the view of many Roman Catholics, was undertaken by the revolutionary government through its declaration against the obligatory celibacy of the priesthood. Acts passed in the latter half of the year 1793 sanctioned the marriage of the priests, and forbade their superiors to censure or deprive them for making use of their privilege. Nor were the authorities always content with a simple permission of nuptials. We read of officious magnates in the departments, who employed means of coercion, more or less direct, to constrain the priests to take wives. The permit and the pressure combined had a perceptible result. Several bishops, as well as a considerable fraction of the lower clergy, entered into the holy and honorable estate of matri-

mony.[1] The number of married priests, not including members of monastic orders, has been placed as high as twelve thousand.[2]

It could hardly be expected that the revolutionary era, with its clangor and excitement, would afford any ground for mysticism. Nevertheless, it was precisely in this era that the most eminent of French theosophists, Saint-Martin, brought forward his mystical theories. He had been preceded by Martinez Pasqualis, who added to his speculations the practice of theurgic arts, which were assumed to bring him sensible manifestations from the world of spirits. Saint-Martin eschewed the theurgy, and devoted himself to the exposition of theosophic theory. While he predicates the liberty of God, he still thinks of creation as a process of emanation. Back of matter he affirms a living nature, endowed with a capacity of feeling, the spirit of the universe, the source of all sensibility in the creature world. Man in his original estate he conceives to have been "a spiritual hermaphrodite," uniting and reconciling in himself the dispositions of soul and spirit, which are now divided between the sexes. His fall deeply affected nature as well as himself. In connection with the work of redemption a double incarnation or humanification took place. The Son of God first put on the form of man in the celestial Sophia, to whom was committed in the higher sphere an office analogous to that with which the Virgin Mary was honored upon earth. The earthly advent was separated by a long interval from the

[1] Grégoire, Histoire du Mariage des Prêtres en France.

[2] Theiner, Histoire des Deux Concordats, i. 21.

primary humanification. As the existence of matter had its occasion in man's fall, it will be eliminated with his recovery. All evil will finally be abolished.

A biographer has thus sketched the character and genius of Saint-Martin: "He remained a child of his country, notwithstanding the sacrifices which he was able to make to the Oriental spirit and the German spirit, the former represented by Martinez Pasqualis, the latter by Jacob Boehme. But — that which constitutes and will always constitute his greatest title in the eyes of posterity — he has remained himself, a loving and tender soul, a spirit of a delicate and strong cast, whose elevation and frequent profundity do not exclude nicety; finally, an original writer, whose natural grace has the faculty of charming when it does not persuade, and whose ingenious imagination gives a body to all his thoughts. From his works there exhales, so to speak, a perfume of candor and affection, which suffices to save them from oblivion."[1]

V. — THE FRENCH CHURCH IN THE NAPOLEONIC ERA.

The transition to the new century, as it was marked by a transfer of the supreme power to Napoleon, was also signalized by a noteworthy change in the ecclesiastical affairs of France. The motive power back of this change was the ambition of the restless general. Religious convictions and desires, whether of Napoleon or of the French people, had very little to do with the scheme of reconstruction which was set on foot. That this is true of the former is perfectly obvious from the

[1] Ad. Franck, Saint-Martin et son Maître Martinez Pasqualis.

simple fact that he had no such degree of religious conviction as could form a principle of action. Not to make too much of his effort in Egypt to pose as a very respectable Mohammedan, the tenor of his whole career shows that his religion was practically summed up in fatalism and self-worship. Altars were of value in his sight chiefly as supplying stepping-stones to the throne, and religious ceremonials were rated by him as a decent and somewhat necessary part of imperial pageantry. By this we do not mean to assert that religion was formally discarded in his mind, or that he doubted its needfulness to men generally. He did not so much deny it theoretically as subordinate it to political aims.

As respects the French people, it is quite certain that religious conviction and feeling did not forward the reconstruction scheme. The fact is well attested that they had no genuine interest in the scheme, and that they rendered it at best no other assistance than silence and passivity. This did not necessarily imply irreligion or indifference on their part. There was little occasion to think of the resuscitation of a State establishment in connection with Rome as identical with the resurrection of the Church in France. Already in 1796, as Grégoire testifies, public worship was celebrated in 32,214 parishes.[1] Thoughtful men like Lafayette were more than willing to leave religious society freely to supervise its own interests after the model supplied by the United States.[2] Such a plan, says Madame de Staël, would have been generally

[1] Mémoires, i. 307.

[2] De Pressensé, L'Église et la Révolution Française, p. 397.

satisfactory to the nation at the time that Napoleon became First Consul, and started his reconstruction project on the basis of a concordat with the Pope.[1] Not less weighty is the testimony of Consalvi, who acted as the Pope's agent in negotiating the concordat. Unless he was guilty of a vast deal of diplomatic lying, his mission was thoroughly obnoxious to the French nation; for we find him repeatedly writing to his master that the First Consul was the only man who wanted union with Rome, and that an incredible amount of opposition stood in the way of a treaty with his Holiness.[2]

But if Napoleon was not encouraged in his project by the French people, there was no opposition sufficiently strong or well-organized to withstand his will. Accordingly negotiations with the Pope were pushed to their consummation, and in 1801 the publication of the concordat announced the manner in which the civil government and the papacy were to share the rule of the Church in France. By a discreet wording the preamble was made to reflect the intent of Napoleon not to accord a too exclusive place to the Roman Catholic religion. Instead of being declared unqualifiedly the religion of the nation, it is spoken of as "the religion which is professed by the great majority of the citizens of the French Republic." The following are some of the most significant articles: —

[1] Considérations sur la Révolution Française, ii. 258.

[2] The following, dated July 1, 1801, is one of several passages of like significance: Dirò finalmente che la guerra, che si è scatenata qui da un mese e più contro la riunione con Roma supera ogni imaginazione. Bonaparte è il solo che la vuole, ma nel volerla trema et non si vide in forza (Theiner, Concordats, Pièces Justif., p. 51).

"The Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion shall be freely exercised in France. It shall enjoy the right of public worship, subject to the ordinances of police, which the government shall judge necessary for the public tranquillity."

"New limits shall be assigned to the dioceses in France by the apostolic see, taking counsel with the French government."

"The First Consul of the French Republic shall nominate, within three months from the promulgation of the apostolic constitution, the archbishops and the bishops who are to preside over the newly outlined dioceses. The Supreme Pontiff shall give canonical institution according to the forms ordained in relation to France before the change of régime."

"The First Consul shall nominate to the episcopal sees which shall hereafter become vacant new prelates; and to these, as is provided in the preceding article the apostolic see shall give canonical institution."

"Bishops prior to entrance upon their office shall offer in the presence of the First Consul the oath of fidelity which was in vogue before the change of régime."

"The bishops, each in his own diocese, shall assign the limits of new parishes; which assignment shall not obtain effect until the consent of the government has been added."

"The bishops shall nominate to the parishes, but they shall select only such persons as may be acceptable to the government."

"The government of the French Republic undertakes to provide suitable support both to the bishops and to

the parish priests whose dioceses and parishes are embraced in the new circumscription."

"His Holiness recognizes in the First Consul of the French Republic the same rights and privileges which the old government enjoyed in connection with the Holy See."

Pius VII. was of the opinion that in the terms of the concordat he had made as great concessions as were compatible with the dignity of the papal office. It was therefore with no small vexation that he discovered that the First Consul had published, simultaneously with the concordat, a kind of Gallican supplement, the so-called "organic articles." The obvious intent of these articles was to shut the door against papal interference, and to place the management of the French Church as far as possible under the hand of the civil government. We find among them such specifications as these: —

"No bull, brief, rescript, decree, mandate, or other communications from the court of Rome shall be received, published, printed, or otherwise be put into execution, without the authorization of the government."

"No individual calling himself nuncio, legate, vicar, or commissary apostolic, or making use of any other title, shall be able, without the same authorization, to exercise upon French soil any function relative to the affairs of the French Church."

"The decrees of foreign synods, those even of general councils being included, cannot be published in France before the government has examined their form, their agreement with the laws, rights, and franchises of the French Republic, and all that which in their publication can affect the public tranquillity."

"No national or metropolitan council, no diocesan synod, no deliberative assembly shall have place without the express permission of the government."

"Recourse shall be had to the council of State in all cases of abuse on the part of superiors and other ecclesiastics."

"The bishops shall be bound to reside in their dioceses; they shall not be able to leave them without the permission of the First Consul."

"Those who shall be chosen to give instruction in the seminaries shall subscribe the declaration made by the clergy of France in 1682; they shall submit to teach the doctrine contained therein."

Two years after the publication of the French concordat, the Italian — or that which was formed between the Pope and Napoleon as head of recently acquired territories in Italy — was signed. The latter as compared with the former assigns a less extensive range to the civil government in the management of the Church.

Scarcely had the juncture with the Pope been formed before its meaning was revealed. Indeed, men of insight surmised at the beginning of the negotiations with the Roman see that the concordat was but the forerunner of imperialism. Lafayette is said to have taken it in that sense, and to have told Napoleon himself that he was evidently looking forward to a coronation scene wherein the Roman Pontiff should act as chief minister.

As the projector of a new empire designed to rival that of Charlemagne, Napoleon wished to avail himself of the support which might be derived from the prestige

and influence of the Church. His aim was to be served rather than to serve. The Byzantine model was before his mind. At any rate, his autocratic temper urged him on toward that model. As various items in the "organic articles" intimated, he had no tolerance for the notion of a co-ordinate power. He could be complacent to Pope and hierarchy, but only on condition that they should divest themselves of self-motion and act as his satellites.

The servant relation which Napoleon designed for the Church was distinctly manifested in connection with his coronation in 1804. Instead of going to the Pope for the rite, according to the precedent established by Charlemagne, and followed during many centuries by the representatives of the Empire, he made the Pope come to him. Instead of being crowned by the hands of the Pontiff, he placed the diadem on his own head. In the coronation oath, instead of swearing like an obedient son of the Church to defend its interests by repressing all heresy and schism, he swore rather to protect liberty of worship. His word was doubtless a poor guarantee of genuine religious liberty; but the very form of the oath was significant of unshackled sovereignty. It betokened that the new monarch was not the exclusive property of any ecclesiastical organization.

The coronation scene was speedily supplemented by events of kindred import. Napoleon had used the Pope as a servant in making him come to Paris; henceforth he showed that he had no use for him in any other capacity. Scarcely had Pius VII. returned to Rome when he was reminded that he had a master. In re-

sponse to the protest which he made against the seizure of Ancona by the French troops, Napoleon declared with emphasis that his imperial authority extended over all Italy, and even threatened to reduce the Pope to be simply Bishop of Rome, unless he should earn forbearance by good behavior. Nothing but complete surrender to his will could satisfy the autocrat. As Pius VII., though mild and conciliatory in his disposition, would not go to this length, an open breach became unavoidable. In 1808 Rome was occupied by a detachment of the imperial army. The next year the Papal States were formally annexed to the French empire, the Pope was taken captive, and the cardinals were ordered to repair to Paris. From this time till the shadow of approaching overthrow fell upon the remorseless dictator, Pope and cardinals were in the position of prisoners, held to the fulfilment of imperial mandates, dividing their time between resisting, yielding, and retracting what apparently had been conceded. It was not till the allied armies were well on their way to the occupation of Paris that the decree was issued for restoring the States of the Church to pontifical sovereignty.

While thus subordinating the acknowledged chief of the hierarchy, Napoleon of course exhibited no great amount of awe for lesser dignitaries. Unbounded flatteries invited him to make a servant of the French Church; and he was not backward to accept the invitation. Perhaps the most striking form of obeisance exacted toward his Imperial Highness was involved in the use of the "Catéchisme de l'Empire." This catechism, which was authoritatively promulgated in 1806,

contains these questions and answers: "What are the duties of Christians toward the princes who govern them, and what in particular are our duties to Napoleon I., our emperor? — Christians owe to the princes who govern them, and we owe in particular to our emperor Napoleon I. love, respect, obedience, fidelity, military service, the ordinary tributes for the preservation and the expense of the empire and of his throne. To honor and to serve our emperor is to honor and to serve God Himself." "Are there not particular motives which ought to attach us most strongly to Napoleon I., our emperor? — Yes, for he is one whom God has raised up under difficult circumstances to re-establish the public worship of the holy religion of our fathers, and to be its protector. He has restored and conserved public order by his profound and energetic wisdom; he defends the State by his puissant arm, and has become the anointed of the Lord by the consecration which he has received from the sovereign Pontiff." "What ought to be thought of those who fail in their duty to our Emperor? According to the Apostle Paul they resist the order of God Himself, and render themselves worthy of eternal damnation." Surely we have here a marvel in catechetical literature! This bringing of incense into the temple and offering it there to a mortal man, — how much better was it than the mad worship which was paid to the Goddess of Reason in the cathedral of Notre Dame? And yet, the papal legate gave, among others, his express sanction to the Napoleonic catechism.

It has been noticed that Napoleon would not agree to acknowledge the exclusive right of the Roman Catholic

Church in France. On the contrary, he pledged himself to protect dissenting forms of worship. This gave a legal standing to Protestants, and to that extent was a benefit. But parity in this respect with the dominant communion was dearly purchased. "This equality in protection," says Pressensé, "was also an equality in servitude. Protestantism, as we think, lost more than it gained by the new state of things. . . . It may be said that it was decapitated in its interior organization by being deprived of those great deliberative assemblies which had contributed so much to its glory in the past. Persecution had not succeeded in wresting them away, for the church of the wilderness never renounced its synodal organization. But governmental protection put a stop to that which the dragonnades were not able to interrupt, and this it accomplished in an underhanded manner, through the instrumentality of an administrative despotism, which reduced to a dead letter a right of the first order. The laws passed in the spring of 1802 implied that the Protestant churches should have synods; but since the governing power was very careful to refrain from having them organized, the churches were left with nothing but a chimerical promise."[1] For a curtailment of liberty so serious as this, protection and patronage were a doubtful compensation. Protestantism was never designed to be the subject of a patronizing despotic imperialism, the instinctive foe of all free association.

The strange events which filled the last decade of the eighteenth and the first years of the present century

[1] L'Église et la Révolution Française, pp. 437, 438.

had their effect upon the general course of Roman Catholic history. The license of the revolutionary era furnished a persuasive plea in behalf of constituted authority. The arbitrariness which Napoleon mixed with his patronage of the Church was suited to make many of the clergy to feel that they might be as comfortable under a papal master at Rome, as under a Cæsar at Paris, who restrained the hand of the foreign ecclesiastic only that he might himself exercise a more unlimited control. From both sources, — the license and the imperial despotism, — Ultramontanism derived aid and incentives. The former served in particular to ease its way into the French Church. Indeed, it may be said with no small measure of truth that the excesses of the Revolution prepared for the Vatican Council, as the dogmatic excesses of that council are preparing for a new revolution. In making this latter statement we do not presume upon the gift of prophecy. We simply express a conviction which is enforced by the study of French history. We find it impossible to believe that this people will be permanently content to swallow down Ultramontane mysteries without stopping to inquire into their nature. The maxim of Hobbes, which prescribes that dogmas should be taken whole, as sick people take pills, does not fully suit the genius of the French people.

VI. — CHIEF EVENTS IN AUSTRIA, ITALY, AND SPAIN.

Up to the French Revolution, Austrian rule extended over a wide circuit, including a portion of the Nether-

lands and Lombardy as well as the more central regions of German Austria, Bohemia, Moravia, Hungary, and Transylvania. Parma was added at the peace of Vienna in 1738. At the same time, owing to the extinction of the Medici heirs, Tuscany became an Austrian dependency, or at least an affiliated kingdom, its ruler being taken from the royal house of Austria. During the wars of 1740–48 Silesia was surrendered to Prussia. Parma and a portion of Lombardy were also lost. In the partition of Poland (1773–1795) Austria, along with Russia and Prussia, obtained a share of that hapless country. Bukowina, on the eastern border, was secured in 1775, and a portion of Bavaria in 1779. Many changes of boundary occurred during the revolutionary and Napoleonic periods; but after all her humiliations, Austria suffered in the end very little if any retrenchment of her wide limits. While the Netherlands and some other districts were surrendered, a gain was made of the Venetian territories. A vast and continuous tract of country from Milan on the west to the borders of Russia on the east was held from the time of the settlement which followed the overthrow of Napoleon.

In the first half of the eighteenth century Austria was essentially a mediæval State or conglomeration of States. Nobles, clergy, and Emperor were the great factors. The burgher class had a very limited share in the government. The peasants were generally but little above the rank of serfs, and in some quarters fell actually into that rank. Nobles and clergy were the principal landholders. The higher clergy were a kind of preferred branch of the aristocracy, and were drawn

largely from the nobility. In their privileges and functions the nobles presented a distinct image of the old feudal system. The general cast of the government was that of a feudal monarchy. The will of the sovereign, restricted by no definite or comprehensive constitution, was variously limited by local claims and prerogatives. Each province had its own peculiarities of administration and judicial procedure.

Soon after the accession of Maria Theresa, in 1740, a movement was started toward centralization and uniformity in government. The estates were but rarely consulted, and an increasing circle of affairs was brought under the direct supervision of the crown. Under Joseph II., who was admitted to the standing of associate ruler in 1765, and took the full sovereignty in 1780, the movement toward uniform and consolidated rule was urged forward with great vigor. Having scant respect for traditional usages, and being strongly imbued with an idealizing temper, Joseph II. was bent upon securing a homogeneous realm. The type of government toward which he aimed was a bureaucratic absolutism. His rule tended to suppress local and class privileges in favor of the unrestricted sway of the sovereign. But while thus arrogating power, he had a generous intent as to its use. He wished to lift up the lower ranks and to carry forward the people as a whole in the path of intellectual and industrial progress. Accordingly, we find him abolishing serfdom, enlarging the system of public education, and reforming the jurisprudence. In manifold ways he showed that he wished to use absolute authority as a servant of the public weal. He miscalculated, however, the inertia

of the mass which he undertook to manage. His excessive haste to conform everything to a chosen model called out resentments that embittered his last days, and caused his successors to restore much of the old régime.

The imperial title, as is well known, was not hereditary with the Austrian rulers of the eighteenth century. They wore that title in virtue of an election by the German princes to the headship of the empire which had been inaugurated in mediæval times as the successor to the old Roman dominion. It was first in 1804 that the name of Emperor was used as a title of the hereditary sovereign of Austria. Two years later this became the sole meaning of the name in Germany. The interference of Napoleon, and the consequent formation of the Confederacy of the Rhine (1806), under his protection, brought the "Holy Roman Empire" to an end. A preliminary to this transformation had been accomplished shortly before in the secularization of those ecclesiastical States or principalities which had formed so conspicuous a factor in the Germanic system during the preceding centuries. Only one of the ecclesiastical princes, the former Archbishop of Mayence, retained a temporal rule after 1803, and with him it lasted only till 1810.

The political movement which took place under Maria Theresa and Joseph II. had its ecclesiastical counterpart. Their conception of monarchical rule naturally made them reluctant to divide their authority with the dignitaries of the Church. The position of the two monarchs was indeed far from being identical. Maria Theresa was deeply interested to maintain

the supremacy of the Romish faith, and could not easily tolerate the notion of a rupture with the Holy See. Her son, on the other hand, had no disposition to serve specifically as the champion of that faith, and cared little for connection with Rome save as it might be conducive to his political advantage. Ultramontane critics have sometimes been inclined to set him down as a rank unbeliever. No doubt he was more or less conversant with the scepticism which was then spreading through France and Germany. But it does not appear that he took time to reconstruct his own beliefs in conformity with its dictates, or that he was interested to make the attempt. He ran into no such license of free thinking as did his famous contemporary, Frederic II. of Prussia. He retained in a general way the inherited creed, though he was not indignant at dissent therefrom. The intolerant zeal of his mother was something with which he early lost all sympathy. Notwithstanding this contrast in the sovereigns, however, there were some points of similarity in their ecclesiastical policies. Maria Theresa in fact accomplished not a little toward providing the foundation for the radical measures of Joseph II. She both raised barriers against papal interference and laid a vigorous hand upon the affairs of the Church within the realm. We find under her rule a refusal of recognition to a bull of Clement XIII. (1764), as also a formal assertion of the principle that without the previous consent of the government no papal bulls could be published within the territories of Austria (1767). Under her rule likewise the action of papal nuncios was restricted, judicial prerogatives of ecclesiastics over laymen were cancelled,

education was taken under civil auspices, and was formally declared to be an affair of the State, pilgrimages were restricted, a number of the feast days were abolished, and a check was placed upon the growth of the monastic institute by prohibiting increase of the cloisters, and by raising the age at which one was allowed to begin or to finish the novitiate.

Proceeding on this foundation, which indeed his influence had helped in a measure to lay, Joseph II., in the first years of the decade during which he held the throne, went far toward emancipating the Church in Austria from all connection with the papacy. His scheme anticipated in no small degree the radical Gallicanism of the Constituent Assembly in France. He ordained that the bishops of the realm should have the prerogative to grant absolutions and dispensations in the cases which the Pope assumed to reserve to himself, and required them to swear allegiance to the temporal sovereign before taking oath to the Pope. He ordered the bulls Unigenitus and In Coena Domini to be expunged from all books of ritual. He prohibited direct correspondence of religious orders with their generals residing outside the realm. The whole monastic institute was regarded by him as of doubtful utility. Especially did he consider the contemplative orders as giving expression to a useless and unnatural type of piety. He proceeded accordingly to suppress them. Some monasteries belonging to other orders were also included in the proscription. Out of 2,163 cloisters which existed in 1770, 738 had been closed by 1786. Meanwhile he interdicted numerous practices which he rated as superstitious. In fine, Joseph II. scarcely fell

short of the full idea of a State Church, constructed after an Erastian pattern. So intent was he upon his scheme that a visit which the Pope undertook to Vienna to persuade him to a different mind had not the slightest effect. An incentive to halt first came with the conviction that in pressing forward with his reform projects he would provoke a perilous resistance on the part of the ill-prepared peoples with which he had to deal.

At the same time that this practical Gallicanism, if the term may be allowed, was being exemplified in Austria, a theoretical Gallicanism had its champions both in that and in the neighboring countries. In fact the German section of the Roman Catholic Church seemed disposed to compensate for a relative quiescence before Ultramontane claims which the French bishops had imposed upon themselves by their attempt to enforce the bull Unigenitus.

The first notable work which gave impulse to this movement against the papal monarchy appeared in 1763–64 under the pseudonym of Febronius.[1] The real author was John Nicolas von Hontheim, a suffragan of the Archbishop of Treves. The platform laid down was essentially that of the councils of Constance and Basle. The Church, it was claimed, should revert to the constitution which prevailed before the Pseudo-Isidore Decretals had induced an abnormal concentration of power in the hands of the Roman bishop. The only real monarch of the Church is Christ. The bishops are not

[1] Justini Febronii de statu ecclesiæ et legitima potestate Romani Pontificis liber singularis ad reuniendos dissidentes in religione christianos compositus.

mere agents of the Pope, but hold direct relation to Christ from whom they received their prerogatives. The Pope is only the first among the bishops. His primacy is a means of order and association rather than a basis of jurisdiction. He stands within the episcopal body, and must submit to its united will.

Clement XIII. made haste to condemn the work of Febronius. It was nevertheless widely circulated. A reprint appeared at Venice, and portions of it were translated into the Italian language. Other works containing similar teachings were forthcoming in the ensuing years, a prominent specimen being the "Institutes of Ecclesiastical Law" by Paul Joseph Riegger, a professor in the university of Vienna. This treatise, if not so bold in its discussion of papal authority as that of Febronius, was still remote from the Ultramontane position. It conceded large prerogatives to the State in the management of ecclesiastical affairs, and therefore helped in a conspicuous degree to prepare the way for Josephinism, as the Erastian policy of Joseph II. has frequently been called.

It has been noticed that Joseph II., as a means of excluding papal interference, asserted for the resident bishops the full right of granting absolutions and dispensations. This action emboldened some of the German prelates to strive for a greater independence in their relations to Rome. At a congress held in 1786 the archbishops of Cologne, Mayence, Treves, and Salzburg drew up a manifesto, in which they clearly expressed the conviction that there was little room for papal nuncios within their jurisdictions, and that papal briefs and bulls have no binding force apart from the

consent of the episcopate. Unhappily for their cause, the archbishops, depending too much upon the virtue of imperial patronage, had not taken adequate means to secure the co-operation of the suffragan bishops. The Pope found opportunity to persuade the latter that it would not be for their interest to support the scheme of their superiors. After a brief interval, therefore, the archbishops deemed it prudent to retreat from their claims.

The same year which witnessed the movement of the German prelates against papal control was marked by a similar project in Tuscany. Leopold, who ruled this dependency of the house of Austria, shared fully the reform maxims of his brother Joseph II., and endeavored to give them a practical exemplification. Some of his clergy heartily seconded his designs. This was especially true of Scipio Ricci, bishop of Pistoja. A synod consisting of the clergy of his diocese, besides declaring for various practical reforms, expressly ratified the Gallican articles which had been formulated by Bossuet and the French bishops in 1682. But the scheme of the Synod of Pistoja was not generally supported by the clergy of Tuscany, and after the departure of Leopold, in 1790, to succeed his brother upon the Austrian throne, was left without any efficient champion.

The year 1786 may be regarded as marking the culmination of the Gallican movement in Austria and the related countries. Somewhat of a reaction had occurred before the outbreak of the French Revolution, and the sight of the disintegration and overturning which followed in its wake tended greatly to promote the fear of

innovation. Francis II., who succeeded Leopold II. in 1792, was fully imbued with the spirit of reaction. Under his direction the Austrian government took up the function of watch-dog in Europe against all liberalism.

One of the notable measures of Joseph II. was omitted in the preceding account, as being closely related to the fortunes of the Protestants, and therefore most fitly considered in connection with that subject. We refer to his decree in behalf of religious tolerance.

During the rule of Charles VI. (1711–1740), and the larger part of that of Maria Theresa, the condition of the Protestants in the Austrian lands was far from enviable. This was true even of Hungary, where their numerical importance[1] had enforced the concession of legal guarantees for the practice of their religion. The legal provisions in their favor were largely nullified by the intolerant aggressions of resident Roman Catholics, and by the unfriendly action or inaction of the government at Vienna. As an indication of the treatment to which they were subjected we may take the petition which they laid before Maria Theresa at her accession. In their statement of grievances "they represent how Protestant pastors are banished out of whole circuits, and that the people are not suffered to go to hear the Word of God or to receive the Lord's supper in the neighboring county. They are not allowed the quiet use of their own religious books. When some have ventured to go to a neighboring county to hear the Word of God, they have been waylaid by the authori-

[1] Writers who ought to be well-informed estimate their numbers for the middle part of the eighteenth century at three millions.

ties, and their books and even clothes taken from them, without respect to age or sex, or station in life. Others are for the same offence summoned before the county court. Here they have been sentenced to fines and imprisonments in chains. Some are compelled to join the Roman Catholic Church, or are subjected to endless annoyances. The landed proprietors often abuse their rights so far as to compel those residing on their estates to become Roman Catholics, else imprisonment, banishment, and confiscation await them. After some have paid the fine to obtain leave to reside on the estates, they are even then banished. . . . Parties are refused marriage and other rites, indeed even Christian burial; bodies of the dead are torn out of the earth and thrown into some dishonored place, because it is feared that they have not died in the Catholic faith." [1]

In German Austria the Protestants were both denied religious privileges, and were excluded from all public offices. At intervals, a number of them were arrested and condemned to transportation into Transylvania.

These harsh measures were exceedingly offensive to Joseph II. Very soon after his accession to the sole rule he proceeded to bestow upon non-Romanists, if not full equality with the members of the Romish communion, a large measure of rights and privileges. The decree of 1781 provided that they should have freedom of worship throughout the empire; that, wherever they numbered a hundred families, and possessed sufficient means, they should be allowed to build a church, under the restriction that the edifice should be without tower,

[1] History of the Protestant Church in Hungary, translated by J. Craig, pp. 370, 371.

bell, and open communication with the street; that they should be exempt from the obligation to attend mass and religious processions; that they should not be required to take an oath inconsistent with their beliefs; and that their religion should not interfere with their right to acquire real estate, or with their eligibility to civil offices and academic honors. This decree was not designed to give immunity to those who, like the deists, denied Christianity; but all Protestants holding the Augsburg or the Helvetic Confession came within its design.

The result was somewhat alarming to zealous Romanists during the first years of the new liberty. Tolerance provided a vent to secret preferences for the Protestant creed and worship. The Protestants of German Austria, reckoned at about twenty thousand near the middle of the century, were placed in 1782 at 73,722, and in 1787 had reached the much greater number of 156,865. In other regions also the Protestants counted considerable accessions. In Hungary their congregations increased in the years 1783 and 1784 from 272 to 758.

Leopold II. was genuinely interested to continue the tolerant policy of his predecessor. The reign of Francis II., on the other hand, as it tended to restore clericalism, was necessarily unfavorable to the liberty of all who could not pronounce the Roman shibboleth.[1]

[1] We have found the following works most serviceable in connection with the Austrian lands: Adam Wolf und Hans von Zwiedineck-Südenhorst, Oestreich unter Maria Theresia, Josef II., und Leopold II.; Louis Leger, Histoire de l'Autriche-Hongroie; Karl Werner, Geschichte der katholischen Theologie seit dem Trienter Concil; Gieseler Kirchengeschichte; Baur, Kirchengeschichte.

A considerable number of the more important developments connected with the papacy have necessarily been touched upon in the preceding sketch of French and Austrian history. What has already been said cannot have failed to convey the impression that during the eighteenth century the Popes were far from being able to rule even the most thoroughly Roman Catholic portions of Europe according to their will. The odds were in truth decidedly against them. It served them little purpose to attempt resistance to the policy of the secular governments.

While some of the pontiffs yielded gracefully to the demands of the times, others complicated matters by their assertatory bearing. To the latter class may be reckoned Clement XI. (1700–1721). Though in his personal fortunes he was not stricken as were those who lived in the time of revolutionary overturning, he was actually one of the most unfortunate in the whole list. Not only did he commit the two colossal blunders of issuing the bull Unigenitus and canonizing Pius V., but he also made some poor ventures in political affairs. His attempt to quash the royal dignity assumed by the Margrave of Brandenburg was scarcely less than ludicrous. The sovereigns who were instructed not to permit the kingly title to be degraded by being attached to a heretic awarded scant attention to the papal injunction. In matters more directly concerning themselves Roman Catholic princes, as a body, were quite free to give open expression to their resentment against the interference of the Pope. "More than once his nuncio was sent out of Naples; in Sicily the clergy in the interests of Rome were once seized in

a body, and transported to the ecclesiastical States; an intention was displayed in all the Italian States of admitting none but natives to ecclesiastical dignities; in Spain too the nunciature was closed, and Clement XI. at one time thought it would be necessary to cite Alberoni, the prime minister of Spain, before the Inquisition."[1]

In contrast with Clement XI., Benedict XIV. (1740–1758) presents an example of a peace-making pontiff. He had a more than average faculty for discovering what the temper of princes would or would not endure. By means of various concessions he promoted amicable relations with the courts of Portugal, Sardinia, and Naples. The greatest concession, however, was to the Spanish government. Through the concordat of 1753, the Pope resigned nearly the whole of the vast patronage over ecclesiastical positions in Spain, which had been claimed by the Roman see up to that time.

Clement XIII. (1758–1769) was less pacific than his predecessor in the tenor of his administration. As already indicated, he provoked the wrath of the Bourbon sovereigns by his pronounced favor toward the Jesuits, and by his ill-timed effort to discipline the Duke of Parma. So far as can be judged, he was being driven to the wall when death opened for him a door of escape.

Clement XIV. (1769–1774) was well adapted to calm the storm which had arisen. The serenity and moderation which appear in his writings were characteristic of the man. "His religion," says Ranke, "was not zeal, persecution, lust of sway, polemical violence, but

[1] Ranke, History of the Popes, book viii.

peace, lowliness, and inward understanding. From his heart he abhorred the incessant wrangling of the papal see with the Catholic governments, which shook the foundations of the Church. His moderation was not weakness, nor the offspring of necessity, but spontaneous and cordial." [1]

Pius VI. and Pius VII., who ruled respectively through the revolutionary and the Napoleonic era, had not the tolerant breadth of Clement XIV.; but the resistless sweep of events made pontifical assumption too plainly ridiculous that they should exhibit any large measure of it in the midst of the crisis. The latter, as he survived the overthrow of Napoleon, had an opportunity to manifest his real bent. His effort was thenceforth directed to re-establishing the former things. As the first great step in his reactionary policy, he proclaimed the Order of Jesuits restored (1814). There was need, he said, of these experienced rowers in the midst of the storms to which the Church was exposed. Among the rocks which he expected that their trained hands would help the ship of Peter to avoid, he seems to have included a knowledge of the Bible. At any rate he took pains to warn against danger from this source. We find him in 1817 rebuking the work of Bible Societies as pestiferous and destructive to the foundations of religion. [2]

The Austrian influence in Italy was in full harmony with the reactionary policy of the Pope. A zeal for

[1] History of the Popes, book viii.

[2] These are the words in which he describes such societies: impiæ novatorum machinationes, . . . inventum quo ipsa religionis fundamenta labefactantur (Baur, Kirchengeschichte, v. 118).

the old order of things also possessed the restored rulers of the several Italian States. Everything associated with liberalism was frowned upon. The freer spirits had speedy occasion to observe that in getting rid of the dominion of Napoleon a poor exchange had been made, since the existing régime involved no more liberty and far less of rational attention to the public good than had prevailed under his rule, or that of his representatives. Immediate discontent resulted, and that series of agitations was begun which later in the century was to culminate in the overthrow of the Pope's temporal power, and in the unification of Italy.

A similar order of events took place in Spain. During the latter part of the eighteenth century this country, sharing the common impulse of the European nations, had begun to limit ecclesiastical interference and control. Charles III. (1759–1788), who caused the expulsion of the Jesuits, though less radical than Joseph II. of Austria, went a perceptible distance in the same direction, abridging papal jurisdiction within the realm, diminishing the number of monasteries, and placing limits upon the independence of the Inquisition. But a thoroughly contrary movement followed after the close of the Napoleonic usurpation (1808–1814). Ferdinand VII. had no sooner regained his throne than he made haste to revive the old régime, with its phases of predominant clericalism and stolid despotism. As in Italy, a spirit of revolt was stirred up by this blind and oppressive conservatism. It took but a few years to precipitate an outbreak.

In the restoration scheme of Ferdinand VII. a foremost item was the reconstituting of the Inquisition,

which Napoleon had abolished in Spain, as also in Italy. During the three quarters of a century preceding, the Holy Office had been no such flourishing shrine of Moloch as in former times. Llorente was not able to discover that more than four were committed to the flames during the reigns of Charles III. and Charles IV.[1] (1759–1808).

A special source of concern to the inquisitors in this period was introduced by the spread of free-masonry. A bull of Clement XII., issued in 1738, called attention to the ill deserts of the free masons. In 1740 the Spanish King followed the tenor of the papal sentence in a royal ordinance. Like action was taken by Pope and King in 1751. Some members of the secret order were condemned to the galleys. As the records of the Inquisition show, free-masonry was regarded as allied with indifferentism and infidelity, — an organized substitute for Christianity as a positive religion.[2] Charges of this kind were urged in a trial of the year 1757. Among the masonic ceremonies the use of skulls was specified as worthy of grave reprobation, — a part of the impeachment which suggests a lack of homogeneity in the Romanism of the time. As was indicated on a previous page, it was near this very time that the high-born ladies of the French court were using skulls as an orthodox aid to their devotions.

The restoration of the Inquisition in Spain by Ferdinand VII. was hardly worth his pains, for it fell again in 1820. Portugal parted with the institution in 1826. It had already disappeared from the Italian States, ex-

[1] Histoire de l'Inquisition d'Espagne, iv. 93.

[2] Llorente, iv. 53–78.

cept the patrimony of Peter, having been abolished in Lombardy as early as 1775, and in Sicily and Tuscany in 1782. In Venice, where it had a political significance, it came to an end in 1797. After 1826 papal sovereignty alone afforded it a refuge. It continued to exist within the States of the Church, though mainly as a board of censure under the papal presidency.[1]

As respects the theological literature of the Roman Catholic Church in the period under review, there was little whose originality or depth calls for mention, though learned compilers were not wanting. The following were some of the more distinguished writers: Calmet and Chateaubriand in France; Benedict XIV., Muratori, and Liguori in Italy; Jahn, Hug, Gerbert, Stattler, and Sailer in the German countries.

[1] Compare Alzog, Kirchengeschichte, § 373.

CHAPTER IV.

GERMANY AND THE NEIGHBORING PROTESTANT STATES (1720–1821).

I. — GENERAL GLANCE AT GERMANY.

THE event of largest political consequence in the history of Germany during the eighteenth century was the advance of Prussia to the rank of a great European power. This Protestant State was thus made a counterpoise to Roman Catholic Austria, and a foundation was prepared for the new Germanic empire which was to arise a century later.

Frederic II., who came to the throne in 1740, and ruled till 1786, was the chief agent in bringing to Prussia her signal enlargement of power and influence. Receiving a country which contained less than two and a quarter millions of inhabitants, he left a realm which embraced six millions. Some part of his success may doubtless be credited to his father. Frederic William I. had faithfully husbanded the resources of his kingdom, and diligently acted the part of royal drill-sergeant. An efficient army was accordingly prepared for his successor. Still the prosaic work of the father would have availed comparatively little had it not been supplemented by the marked genius and energy of the son. A man of ordinary ability might perhaps have

seized Silesia, under the conditions which were presented at the transference of the Austrian crown to Maria Theresa. But to hold this territory against a great European combination, as it was held by Frederic II. during the Seven Years' War (1756–1763), — that will ever rank as one of the prodigies of military history.

The internal administration of Frederic II. had its noteworthy points. He gave needed attention to reforming the jurisprudence of the realm. In the first days of his reign an order was issued for abolishing the use of torture in criminal trials. He chose a policy of tolerance in religious matters, adopting the maxim that each man should be allowed to be saved in his own fashion. He was averse to shackling the press, and granted to it a large, if not a complete, liberty. His general theory of the kingly office was clear and intelligible, without blur or halo of political mysticism. The king, as he conceived, was simply the foremost servant of the public weal, holding his place for the nation, instead of the nation being an attachment to his sovereign person. At the same time he was not minded to assign a limited sphere to this foremost servant. He thought that the king, in order to serve effectually, should rule pervasively. From this point of view he looked with no favoring glance upon the aristocratic scheme which had been handed down from the age of feudalism, regarding it as divisive in tendency, and obstructive to a thorough and just exercise of authority. Like Joseph II. he was disposed to give scant regard to the intervening steps between the throne and the general mass of the people; but he had more prudence than his younger contemporary, whose ambi-

tious temper, as we have seen, led him to undertake greater transformations than he could accomplish.

In his literary and intellectual life Frederic II. was a satellite of the French school of the era. The vivacity and brilliancy of the sceptical literati, of whom Voltaire was a leading representative, early found in him an impressible subject, and to the end his taste and thinking continued to take their color from this source. He did nothing, at least nothing directly, to prepare for that great era of German literature and philosophy, whose dawning light was already mounting above the horizon as he passed off the stage.

As Frederic looked to the French school for literary diversion and mental stimulus, he naturally borrowed thence also his notions on religious subjects. He imbibed the deistic teaching of Voltaire, and confined himself to this poor nourishment throughout his public career. The measure of consolation which he derived from his creed was not large. "Instinctively he believed," says Carlyle, "that right alone has ultimately any strength in this world. Ultimately, yes, — but for him and his poor brief interests, what good was it? Hope for himself in Divine Justice, in Divine Providence, I think that he had not practically any; that the unfathomable Demiurgus should concern Himself with such a set of paltry, ill-given animalcules as one's self and mankind are, this also is in the main incredible to him."[1] On the whole, the best thing in Frederic's connection with religion was the discretion which withheld him from any intemperate propagandism of his private negations. He may have mingled an unseemly

[1] History of Friedrich II. of Prussia, xiii. 360.

measure of cynicism with his treatment of the clergy; but he made no attempt to force his subjects to his way of thinking. It remained for the Revolutionists in France to show that a headlong unbelief may use the scourge of intolerance with a vigor no less merciless than that of a headlong faith.

The next two kings of the Hohenzollern line — the second and the third Frederic William — shared but moderately in the mingled sagacity and daring of their predecessor. They afforded accordingly a leadership quite below the demands of the mighty crisis which came upon Europe in their time. The part fulfilled by Prussia for a considerable portion of the epoch of upheaval was far from distinguished. After the first feeble effort, in co-operation with Austria, to hem in the Revolution, Prussia stood with folded hands, a witness to the humiliation and despoilment of her neighbors, but doing nothing for their relief. When at length she bestirred herself, it was only to be terribly beaten. The battles of Jena and Auerstädt (1806) left her under the heel of the French dictator, there to remain until the awful fatalities of the Russian campaign should give hope of a possible overthrow of the oppressor. But the bitter visitation was not without its compensations. In humbling Prussia and her sister States, Napoleon was doing much greater service to Germany than to France. More community of feeling, more Germanic patriotism sprang out of this era of tribulation than had been witnessed previously.

At the Congress of Vienna (1814–15), which undertook the task of redistributing the territories which had been overrun by Napoleon, there was a general en-

deavor to return to the old boundaries, though some exceptions were allowed. But no attempt was made to restore the Empire which had received its death-blow in 1806. In place of the old system a confederation was established for purposes of mutual defence. Within this union, which could boast only feeble bonds of coherence, Austria and Prussia held the place of chief direction. That their rivalry would sooner or later precipitate a struggle was something that might have been foretold without the aid of any extraordinary prophetic gift.

The history of German Protestantism in the period before us is mainly a history of philosophy, criticism, and theology. It may be regarded as falling into two principal divisions, the first extending from the beginning of Wolf's philosophizing to the publication of Kant's "Critique of the Pure Reason" (1781), and the second reaching on from that point to Schleiermacher's completed system, as it was given forth in his "Christliche Glaube" (1821). In both eras the movement of thought was not a little diversified. Neither of the two great factors which divided the field at the outset, namely, Pietism and the old Orthodoxy, was able to hold its ground. Impinged upon by a native philosophy which gave seductive promises of a definite and thorough grasp of truth, and also by the currents of English and French thought, they began to drift from their moorings. The general direction of the drift is indicated with approximate accuracy when the ensuing period is characterized as the age of rationalism. But it ought to be remembered that the type of thought

which is denoted by that name was never supreme either in the Wolfian or the Kantian era, that there were reactions against it in one form or another, that more or less of constructive effort was mixed with the tearing-down process, and that in truth some valuable work was accomplished toward introducing a sounder and more nearly impregnable interpretation of the religion of the Bible than had been current hitherto.

The preceding paragraph may serve to indicate the task to which we are to give attention. External events will make but small demand upon our consideration. Aside from the rise of Moravianism under Zinzendorf, which has already been noticed, one of the most noteworthy in this class of events was that which came in the closing years of the period,—the attempted union of the two leading Protestant communions. The project was started in Prussia, where the relations between the Lutherans and the Reformed were such as to give special encouragement. The initial step toward the union was taken in 1817, in connection with the three hundredth anniversary of the Reformation. A royal communication directed to the various consistories, synods, and superintendents expressed the wish that, without injury to the faith of either, the two churches might henceforth be united. The scheme of the Prussian monarch was copied in Nassau, Baden, Rhenish Bavaria, Anhalt, and a part of Hesse. But the result aimed at was only partially realized. Zealous Lutherans began to agitate against the union, and it was not long before an independent Lutheran Church claimed acknowledgment in Prussia.

In considering the movement of the age on its intel-

lectual side, we may seem to enter the sphere which we have assigned to the *history of doctrine.* But so large a practical outcome has flowed from the activity of this age in philosophy and criticism, that *general church history* may properly take note of its characteristic developments.

II. — THE WOLFIAN ERA.

The Leibnitz-Wolfian philosophy was the first of the modern systems to enter into close alliance with theological thinking in Germany. The first quarter of the eighteenth century had nearly passed before the modified Aristotelianism, which may be described in general terms as the philosophy of the Reformers, had begun to be displaced in any conspicuous measure within the bounds of Lutheranism.

Leibnitz, who had the honor of initiating the succession of German philosophies, was influenced by two lines of antecedents. On the one hand was the Baconian system, with its emphasis upon sensation and reflection, upon experience and induction. On the other hand was the Cartesian philosophy, with its stress upon self-inspection, intuition, and deduction. The disciples of the one system ran into a greater or less excess of sensationalism. Hobbes taught a crass materialism, and Locke, though he repudiated materialism, gave the senses the primacy as sources of knowledge, representing the mind as depending upon them for all positive content, or as being apart from them like an empty cabinet. The disciples of Carte-

sianism, on their side, denied the dependence of mind upon matter, and sought a bond of connection between the two in the overshadowing agency of God. In the representation of Malebranche, this divine agency greatly reduces, rather than entirely eliminates, man's activity. With Spinoza, all self-action utterly disappears, and we have simply the infinite and eternal substance unfolding itself by a necessary process of evolution in a double series, the thought series and the extension series, or finite minds and bodies.

The results reached in either line of philosophic movement were not agreeable to Leibnitz. Fully convinced that mind is the fundamental reality, he could not accept any scheme of radical sensationalism. At the same time he was not satisfied with the unmitigated dualism between mind and matter, between soul and body, which had place in Cartesianism. No more was he pleased with the elimination of all proper individuality and design from the universe, as these results were reached in the pantheism of Spinoza. In opposition to sensationalism he emphasized the idea that the mind, so far from being an empty cabinet, is a positive entity, having its fixed constitution or laws of thought, upon which laws depend those necessary truths that lie at the basis of all rational inference. As a means of bridging over the wide chasm interposed by Cartesianism between mind and matter, he predicated a graduated scale of being in the created universe, — being rising through minute intervals from the lowest to the highest, the difference between one stage and another being due not so much to diversity of substance as to unequal degrees of development in similar units of

substance. The unit of substance is a closed unit, a monad. As such it has complete and persistent individuality. In this conception Leibnitz provides an offset to Spinozism. The monad embodies thoroughly the idea of continued identity or selfhood. Moreover, in the primal constitution of the monad, and in its relations to its fellows, an abundant field is secured for the teleological point of view.

Thus Leibnitz viewed the universe as composed of monads in different stages of development. None of these are entirely destitute of life, motion, and perceptive power. But some are in a state like to profound slumber. Some have only an inchoate and obscure consciousness. Human souls are monads in that high stage of progress where self-consciousness has reached a good measure of clearness. The body is an aggregate of monads, whose appearance of continuous extension is due to a certain confusion in our sensuous perceptions.[1]

Since the monads were regarded as developing from within, and as being destitute of all interaction, their orderly relation and correspondence were explained by reference to a primitive arrangement or pre-established harmony. The preservation of the established order requires, it was conceived, the exclusion of contingency proper. Though the human will is not mechanically controlled in its choices, it is always directed to a predetermined end, inasmuch as it yields to a preponder-

[1] "Body" seems indeed to have another sense in the system of Leibnitz besides that noted. While an aggregate of monads may stand in the relation of body to a specific monad, each monad, viewed by itself, is at once soul and body; in other words, soul and body are powers or aspects of the same indivisible entity.

ance of motives. There can be no failure as respects the designed outcome of the universe. The optimistic view is consequently justified, the perfections of God assuring us that a world which has been prearranged in every point by Him must be the best possible.

A glance at the outline of the Leibnitzian system may perhaps suggest that God is to be regarded as rather a requirement for starting the universe, than as its inmost life and the necessary ground of its continued subsistence. But in fact Leibnitz had no ambition to close the world against divine agency. He was friendly to positive religion, allowed the possibility of specific revelations, and left open a place for mysteries by drawing a distinction between what is above reason, and what is contrary to reason.

Leibnitz may justly be characterized as a speculative genius. Wolf, on the other hand, was the formalist and systematizer. He had little of that quick and penetrative insight which makes one a discoverer of truth, or enables him to leaven his discourse with fruitful suggestions. His mind was of the prosaic order, with a decided predilection for the mathematical method. Still, he was qualified to exercise in his day, and did exercise, a widespread influence. His attention to orderly arrangement and to intelligibility served to recommend philosophy as something which the man of ordinary acquirements might hope to understand. The circle of those who interested themselves in philosophical topics was thus greatly enlarged through his agency. In fine, the intellectual life of Germany for several decades owed to him very largely the specific channels in which it flowed.

While Wolf held to the optimism and determinism of Leibnitz, he declined to go the full length of his daring speculations respecting monads. In particular, he forsook the principle of continuity, or graduated development in nature, by limiting perception entirely to souls, thus interposing a decided interval between them and other classes of monads. He was also inclined to admit the possibility of a natural interaction between soul and body. But these changes were the lesser part of the transformation which Wolf wrought in the philosophy of Leibnitz. By casting it into the moulds of an exact formalism he quenched its original spirit. Under his leadership a great zeal was developed for precise arrangement and verbal demonstration. This bias had its benefits; but it also had its disadvantages. In their devotion to a fixed method not a few came far short of a congenial interpretation of this or that line of reality, and were inclined to discredit whatever did not conform to their scant and inflexible pattern. In fine, Wolfianism tended to sacrifice a part of truth by attempting to inclose the whole in a close-bound and inadequate system.

The professed attitude of Wolf toward revealed religion was sufficiently friendly. Still his treatment of the subject had its questionable side. While he allowed the possibility of a supernatural revelation, he affirmed such conditions for its bestowment upon the race as naturally to awaken doubts whether the possibility had ever been fulfilled. Only then, he taught, can a revelation properly take place when it is absolutely necessary for men to know something which they could never grasp in the use of their own reason. In

like manner, he excluded all miracles except in a case where the result to be reached could not possibly be attained by natural means. Obviously such maxims could easily be made to serve a deistic scheme.

The theologians in the first instance looked somewhat askance at the philosophizing of Wolf. Both Lange, the Pietist, and Löscher, the champion of the old Lutheran orthodoxy, who had long and earnestly employed their weapons against one another, felt summoned to attack the new system. Meanwhile, the cause of the opposition was not conducted by way of argument alone. The government was appealed to, and responded by banishing Wolf from the University of Halle, and from Prussian territory. This occurred in 1723. It was not till after the accession of Frederic II. that Wolf returned to Halle. The tide, however, had turned in his favor at an earlier date. Almost from the time of his banishment up to the closing quarter of the century the Wolfian philosophy was in the ascendant.

The theological result of this ascendency appeared first of all in a class of writers who may be called Wolfian supernaturalists. Here belong, among others, Canz, Büttner, Carpov, Reinbeck, Reusch, Schubert, and S. J. Baumgarten. Some of the later representatives were Jerusalem, Zollikoffer, Spalding, and Teller. While conceding a place to mysteries and miracles, the writings of these men still are characterized by a certain deistic tang. There was a reluctance on their part to admit the immediate agency of God, a tendency to limit the range of His inner working, and to view Christianity principally as a system addressed to the

understanding. The utilitarian point of view was also made conspicuous, and a disposition was fostered to rate different orders of truths according to the notion entertained of their practical benefit. This bent, joined with a zest for intelligibility, caused the main stress to be laid upon the ethical side of Christianity. The deeper mysteries of the faith were felt to be a burden, and in individual instances were abandoned. Thus Töllner and some others substituted an Arianizing view for the trinitarian theory.

A second class of writers may be characterized as Wolfian deists. Reimarus, the author of the so-called "Wolfenbüttel Fragments," falls unqualifiedly under this description. Creation was the only miracle tolerated in his scheme. As for the New Testament narratives, he saw in them only ill-agreeing stories of intentional deceivers. Edelmann was equally alienated from all faith in positive religion, as was also the notorious Bahrdt in the latter part of his career. It was likewise an essentially deistic platform which was occupied by such representatives of "Illuminism," or supposed intellectual reform, as Moses Mendelssohn, Nicolai, and Basedow. The last was much taken with Rousseau's views on education, and labored, not without some favorable results, to apply them. Nicolai, in his "Universal German Library," sought to make the whole field of knowledge accessible to the German people. The work conveyed much information, but was too largely occupied in commending the one-sided and superficial system of the Illuminists. Mendelssohn was an industrious preacher of natural religion. In his thought religion was only another name for moral-

ity. A common characteristic of these men was their confidence. They do not seem to have dreamed that their measuring rod was too short, but unhesitatingly disparaged, as superstition or absurdity, everything that did not fall within the prescribed limits. In these respects they represent a genus known to other times and fields. They figured indeed very much as half-philosophers, who make a special boast of common-sense, are likely to figure under the stimulus of a sceptical atmosphere.

A third class of writers, which may be regarded as having a larger significance than either of the preceding, represented a new phase of Biblical criticism in Germany. The leaders of the rising critical school were Ernesti in exegesis, and Semler in historical theology. The noticeable feature in the procedure of Ernesti was its independence of the canons of interpretation that were applied in the preceding era. Not only did he reject the mystic or allegorical method which had some currency in the Pietistic school, but also the dogmatic method which required interpretation to follow the analogy of the faith. The Bible, he maintained, should be investigated in essentially the same way as any other book, grammatical and historical considerations being made the basis in determining the meaning of the text. As to the merits of this exegetical method, it is to be allowed that it is in large part worthy of commendation. The main fault of Ernesti seems to have been an inadequate stress upon a congenial spirit in the interpreter, — in other words, too little reference to the need of reaching as far as possible the unique standpoint of a Biblical writer in order to catch the genuine import of his discourse.

Semler, a disciple of Baumgarten, blended with far more than average scholarship a decided leaning to individuality in his opinions. At heart he was something of a Pietist, a man possessed of deep conscientiousness, permeated by an ardent devotion to Christ, and maintaining a home life of singular beauty. But his piety was not allowed to shackle his thinking. Theology was reckoned by him as quite distinct from religion. So thoroughly did he regard religion a personal matter that he looked with jealousy upon all restraint or pressure through the medium of dogmatic authority. His standard for judging the Biblical books was largely a subjective one. Recalling a principle which Luther had recognized, he taught that the moral and spiritual impression conveyed by a writing is above all things else the valid credential, the token of divine origin. Applying this test, he made wide distinctions among the Biblical books. While accepting in general the credibility of the Pentateuch, he attributed the present form of these writings to a later hand than that of Moses. He saw little or no indication of inspiration in a large portion of the historical books of the Old Testament, and rejected the book of Esther as a fiction. In the New Testament his preferred ground was the Fourth Gospel and the Pauline Epistles. He thought that the Synoptic Gospels deal too largely in outward matters, and accord too much space to miracles. The Apocalypse, as he conceived, falls below the spiritual plane of Christianity, and is largely tinged with Judaism. In general, Semler's work was of a disintegrating sort. While he helped toward a scientific treatment of the Bible through the impulse which

he gave to the employment of the historical method, he used that method himself more in the interest of negation than of construction. The effect of his work upon men who lacked his earnest piety was naturally adverse to the recognition of supernatural elements in Biblical religion. A philosophic faculty, supplying a more extended field of vision, was a much needed supplement to Semler's critical acuteness.

Eichhorn, the publication of whose "Old Testament Introduction" in 1780 brings him within this era, but who was also active as an author in the Kantian period, represents a pronounced type of rationalistic criticism conjoined with traces of a conservative bias. While disposed to rule out the supernatural, he had a strong confidence in the major part of Biblical history, and did not depart widely from traditional views as to the authorship of the Biblical books.

Among the groups of writers who stand rather in contrast with Wolfianism than in association therewith, the school of Bengel, which had its headquarters in Württemberg, occupies a conspicuous place. The temper of Bengel was that of Pietism in its better phase. With an evangelical earnestness he combined an amiable breadth of feeling. His theology was in an emphatic sense Biblical theology,—speculative dogmatics and confessions, while not formally eschewed, being left by him quite in the background. An ambition to unfold the mysteries of the Apocalypse caused some waste of scholarly effort on his part; still his contribution to Bible study was of no slight value. Both in textual criticism of the New Testament and in exegesis, he made the following generations his debtors.

The impress of Bengel is seen in Philip Matthias Hahn, the author of treatises affiliating with mysticism, in the hymn-writer Hiller, in Urlsperger, the founder of the German Christian Society, and in Oetinger. The last holds a place of considerable distinction among theosophists. He has sometimes been called the Magus of the South, in comparison with the oracular and obscure, but suggestive Hamann, the Magus of the North. In many particulars he reproduces Boehme and anticipates Baader. He shows also points of kinship with Schelling and Rothe. Like theosophists in general, he has a ruling ambition to bring nature and spirit into most intimate association, to blend into a unity idealism and materialism. The idea of bare spirit is repugnant to him. Accordingly he carries up nature into God Himself, representing the abounding life which He possesses as objectifying itself in an indissoluble and luminous body, spoken of in Scripture as God's glory or as the light wherein He dwells. The proper destiny of man, he represents, is to reflect in his measure this ideal union of spirit and nature. The corporeal is not to be cast aside. It is an essential to living spirit, and only needs to be transfigured and brought into conformity with the higher demands of spirit. This process of transfiguration or spiritualization is accomplished sooner in some than in others. But all at length reach the goal; all attain unto the resurrection state. The fiery torments into which the wicked are plunged have their limit. Ultimately every child of the race attains to blessedness, — an outcome that agrees well with the prominence which the physical point of view has in the system of Oetinger, but

which is not so certainly in keeping with human autonomy, with its fearful possibilities of persistent abuse and progressive deterioration of the moral faculties.[1]

The school of Bengel naturally suggests the names of Stilling and Lavater. Like the members of this school they combined religious earnestness with a certain bent to eccentricity. Far removed from the deistic temper of the age, they believed that mystery and miracle lie close to man's pathway, and that the supernatural is repeatedly overflowing into the sphere of the natural. In some of their views they indicated an appreciative acquaintance with the writings of Swedenborg.

Hamann, whose peculiar style was noticed above, represents the antithesis of the Wolfian stress upon formal demonstration. "For him the highest principle of truth was not the law of contradiction, which the Wolfians everywhere made the criterion of knowledge, but the *coincidentia oppositorum* of Giordano Bruno, the oneness of opposites, the union of A and not-A. He did not regard the logical understanding as the spring of truth, but assigned that office to feeling, expressing itself not in clear, logical, cogent thinking, but in sentiment, which works all the more certainly because it works in the dark."[2]

That a prosaic intellectualism did not rule the whole field in this era is made manifest still further by the names of Klopstock, Gellert, Haller, and Claudius, not to mention such hymn-writers from the earlier part of the century as Schmolck, Freylinghausen, Bogatzky,

[1] See Auberlen, Die Theosophie Oetinger's.

[2] Kronenberg, Herder's Philosophie.

Tersteegen, and Waltersdorf. Klopstock held a very significant position in his age, as combining the German spirit with an appreciation for classic forms, and also with a firm evangelical faith. His extensive poem, the "Messiah," may tax, it is true, the patience of the modern reader, and one may turn with a certain sense of relief from its vague and labored representation of Christ to the living pages of the gospel narratives; nevertheless, the elaborate epic had its message for that generation, being both religiously and poetically edifying to a great number of the German people. In Gellert a lyric talent, regulated by simplicity and moderation of spirit, often found happy expression. While his hymns do not reflect the intenser phases of Christian feeling, they meet so well the average demand of worship as naturally to claim a wide acceptance. Haller, like his contemporary, Euler, was a man who blended with scientific labor the spirit and belief of a devout Christian. His poetry is of the didactic rather than of the lyric order. Claudius made his gift for popular expression tributary to a lively and intense appreciation of Biblical truth.

III.—FROM KANT TO SCHLEIERMACHER.

The principal works of Kant, beginning with the "Critique of the Pure Reason," fell between the beginning of the year 1781 and the end of the year 1793. This interval may properly be regarded as one of the greatest eras in the history of philosophy. In the modern world no single mind has afforded a profounder

intellectual incentive than that which came from the Königsberg professor.

A leading item in the significance of Kant is the searching scrutiny which he expended upon the problem of knowledge. Awakened by the scepticism of Hume, he labored with great diligence to determine the conditions and limits of human cognition.

The result, on the one side, was a repudiation or emphatic qualification of sensationalism. Not denying that sensations are a necessary means of acquaintance with objective reality, Kant maintained still that in themselves they are far from constituting knowledge. They make only a confused manifold, and must remain in the sphere of blind impressions unless met by an arranging and interpreting faculty not contained in themselves. Only in a subject having unity of consciousness and furnished with *a priori* forms of intuition and thought can they obtain any proper relation and meaning. In virtue of its original constitution the mind has its view-points or categories under which all materials must be subsumed if they are to become objects of knowledge. Thus far the Kantian analysis evidently gives dignity to the human mind, making its activity a condition of all rational experience, and lifting it far above the rank of a mere resultant of material forces.

On the other side, the outcome of Kant's investigation was an emphatic limitation upon the power of the mind to establish ultimate truth in a speculative way. If the mind takes its own necessary intuitions and forms of thought, though it may weave them into an elaborate system, it can have no assurance that this

system is anything more than a complex of abstractions. The materials used being purely subjective, there is no pledge that the combination represents aught beyond the circle of subjectivity. If in place of this subjective flight the mind looks outward toward what is given in sense-perception, it strikes indeed upon objective reality, yet only upon the surface of this reality. It reaches only phenomena. What lies back of phenomena, if in truth there is anything beyond, it has no means of seeing or demonstrating. It knows how things affect itself, but things in themselves it does not know. Self and the phenomenal world seem thus to make up the whole sphere of reality respecting which the human mind can gain proper knowledge.

Is then all that lies beyond, including God and His immortal kingdom, to be ignored as out of relation to man, or beyond the sphere of authorized conviction? This is far from being Kant's conclusion. In his view, what is beyond the reach of intuition or demonstration may yet be practically demanded, and so be an object of faith. A very urgent demand of this kind exists. Man knows himself as a moral being. His nature asserts a comprehensive law of duty, a *categorical imperative*, which may be expressed in terms like these: So act that the maxim of thy will can always hold good as a principle of universal legislation. The presence of this law, as an inalienable factor of man's moral consciousness, legitimates belief in a moral system, and in the essential constituents of a veritable moral system, namely, freedom, immortality, and the existence and government of God. The speculative reason has nothing to offer against these great truths, and, as the prac-

tical reason demands them, it is but the exercise of a rational faith to accept them.

From this it is evident that the outcome of Kant's system, as understood by himself, was not a radical agnosticism. A theistic faith based upon and required by imperishable data of the moral consciousness is at a great remove from blank ignorance and uncertainty. Some further warrant for rational conviction may indeed be attainable. The æsthetic impress made by a speculative or historical ideal, where this impress is sufficiently steadfast and general, has an evidential force as well as the bare sense of duty. It must also be confessed that Kant fell short of the truth, and opened a door to scepticism, by questioning the objective validity of the categories, or the fundamental forms of thought. Still, it is fair to acknowledge that he conceived of theistic faith as being demanded by philosophy, and considered that his own system made rather for its support than for its overthrow.

While Kant conceived of man as a religious being, he was averse to including in the idea of religion anything more than the attitude toward the moral law as the will of God expressed in and through man's nature. In other words, he considered morality the real core of religion, and had but slight appreciation for that order of supernatural communications which Christianity, as a positive religion, predicates. He regarded the supposition of miracles as prejudicial to a scientific view of nature, and argued that in the event of their occurrence they could furnish only a dubious ground of inference, since it would be impossible to trace them to their source, so as to identify with certainty God's will and

agency back of them. He admitted the possibility of specific revelation, but denied that it is a necessary ground of religion. Such a revelation could be at most a means of fostering religion, the ground of which lies in man's moral constitution. Its office would be simply pedagogical; that is, it would supply incentives and aids to the attainment of an end which the reason and moral sense of men set before them, and obligate them to pursue. A positive religion, he maintained, has a title to universality only so far as it agrees with that which has its ground within. The root ideas of the New Testament meet this test, and so are adapted to be a part of the universal faith. In the interpretation of a written revelation it is wisdom to choose the sense which is practically edifying, rather than to direct the whole effort to reaching the meaning in the mind of the sacred author.

Kant held that a radical evil, or original sin, characterizes men from the beginning of their moral career. This cannot be a matter of inheritance, since personal demerit and inheritance are utterly irreconcilable notions. It must be imputed rather to an act of will, to a wrong choice, to an election of something less than the supreme moral law to be the maxim of conduct. The proper counteractive is a new choice, or the enthronement of the moral law as the highest maxim of the will. This change is regeneration, the power to effect which must be affirmed of man, though it involves a mystery. Divine agency, in the way of assistance, is not necessarily ruled out of connection with the regenerating act. Still it does not come practically into the account, since one reaches the end by attention to what

is incumbent upon himself rather than by reference to an inscrutable work of another agent. Any view which interferes with cultivating strenuousness of will is not favorable to man's true development.

In regard to the person of Christ, Kant considered that the demand of practical religion is adequately met when He is viewed as the moral ideal, born from eternity in the mind of God, but coming to manifestation in the midst of human history. Belief on Christ he identified with inner appreciation and choice of this ideal. One who makes this choice stands in a justified relation to God. Induction into this relation is a matter of grace, since in the justifying act one is accepted who has neither given compensation for an imperfect past nor yet reached the goal of perfection. The divine clemency overlooks the deficit in consideration of the new purpose and disposition which pledge continuous progress toward perfection.

On the whole, the philosophy of Kant on its religious side cannot be regarded as adequate. While it has a grand feature in the majesty with which it invests the moral law, it views man too exclusively as a mere compound of reason and will, slighting the large function which belongs to imagination and feeling. It places God too far off, and takes insufficient account of the quickening effect which comes to the human mind and heart from a vivid apprehension of the divine presence and agency. The thought of God, as presented by Kant, compares with the thought of Him which comes to expression in the gospel very much as starlight with warm sunshine.[1]

[1] For a summary of Kant's religious views see his treatise, Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der Blossen Vernunft.

The critical philosophy of Kant was followed by that remarkable list of dogmatic and idealistic systems with which the names of Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel are associated. A principal occasion of transition to the dogmatic method on the part of these philosophies was an ambition to overcome the opposition between subject and object, or to gain complete unity by bringing God, man, and nature, under an all-comprehending point of view. In so daring an attempt, as may well be imagined, they found it necessary to draw upon the unknown. Some sweeping assumption was indispensable.[1]

Fichte, having placed the essence of being in action, proceeded to annul the dualism between subject and object by including the latter in the former as an interior result of its act. In the first stage of his philosophy the emphatic point of view was the subordination of the non-ego, or the external world, to the ego, — the former being denied objective reality, and being reduced to the rank of a subjective impression, which the ego induces by positing bounds to itself. In the later stage of his teaching the doctrine of the Absolute was awarded much prominence, and the ego, viewed as limited and self-conscious, was made subordinate to the Absolute. A pantheistic cast was thus given to his philosophy. Permanency was indeed attributed to finite personality, or the self-conscious ego; still, it was made a phase in the development of the Absolute, which, impersonal in itself, gains personality only by means of self-imposed limitations.

[1] The more important works of these philosophers were published between 1790 and 1817.

On the religious side, the philosophy of Fichte contrasts in large part with that of Kant. In place of a bare morality, over which God stands as a remote sanction, Fichte makes prominent the idea of union and communion with the infinite and the eternal. Many of his sentences would be entirely acceptable to a devout mystic. With the Apostle John, whom he regarded, above all other Scriptural writers, the teacher of genuine Christianity, he lays down as fundamental to religion an eternal life having its source in a living fellowship with the divine; and he can find no words too strong to express man's obligation of loving surrender to the supreme object of faith and worship. "Life," he says, "is necessarily blessed; unblessed alone is death. . . . The central point of life is always love. . . . True life and the blessedness thereof consist in union with the unchangeable and eternal. . . . So long as man covets to be aught himself, God does not come to him, for no man can become God. . . . We must truly, according to the figure of a holy doctrine, first die to the world and be born again, before we can enter the kingdom of God. . . . I am connected with the Infinite One, and there is nothing real, lasting, imperishable in me, but the voice of conscience and my free obedience to it. By the first, the spiritual world bows down to me and embraces me as one of its members; by the second, I raise myself into it; and the infinite Will unites me with it, and is the source of it and of me. . . . I am immortal, imperishable, eternal, as soon as I form the resolution to obey the laws of eternal reason; I am not merely destined to become so. . . . What we call heaven does not lie only on the

other side of the grave; it is diffused over nature here, and its light dawns on every pure heart."[1]

As these sayings indicate, a deeply spiritual vein runs through Fichte's thinking. There would be little to criticise were it not for the blank caused by his pantheistic standpoint. To surrender the personality of God, as Fichte does in common with the advocates of pantheism, is not only to relinquish one vitalizing truth, but also much else that depends upon this truth. With this surrender the ground is taken away from the Catholic faith,—or the general belief of Christians,—respecting a divine incarnation, the proper demerit of sin, and the fact of atonement. Christ becomes simply the highest point in that process of individualizing or incarnating the Absolute which is exemplified in each human spirit; and His atonement is but the illustration of man's essential union with the divine,—a rebuke accordingly of the delusion that man is or can be separated from God.

While the system of Fichte was occupied with the evolution of spirit, and made nature simply an unsubstantial accessory to the process, Schelling, in the middle stage of his philosophizing was disposed to coordinate nature with spirit. The inward and the outward, as he conceived, both have reality. Everything is at once body and soul. All differences spring from the differentiation of one primordial substance. If we go back to the source of things we reach complete homogeneity. In the Absolute, all oppositions are cancelled, subject and object are strictly identical. The

[1] The quotations are from the treatises, Die Anweisung zum seligen Leben, and Die Bestimmung des Menschen.

universe is the self-revelation of the Absolute, and the grade of reality in each concrete manifestation depends upon its nearness to the primary source. As nature has its crown in man, so man has his goal back in the bosom of the Absolute. All history is in a sense a record of the divine, a great cosmic poem.

The objective idealism of Schelling tended toward a poetic worship of nature, and was not so directly a call to strenuousness of will as the strongly subjective system of Fichte. Still the former was not without its likeness to the latter, as respects religious bearing. It qualifies in a similar manner some of the leading tenets of the Catholic creed. As with the elder philosopher, the doctrine of the incarnation becomes the doctrine of a continuous divine process. "The incarnation," says Schelling, "is an incarnation from eternity. The man Christ is in manifestation only the culmination, and in so far also again the beginning of the same; for from Him it is to progress, in virtue of the fact that all His disciples shall be members of one and the same body of which He is the head." [1]

In his later philosophy, Schelling followed very largely the theosophic scheme of Boehme. As at this stage he substituted the idea of a personal God for his pantheistic conception of the Absolute, so also he modified his view of Christ, regarding Him as primarily a divine potence in the Father, which at the end of creation appeared in the character and rank of a Divine Person.

The task of expounding the Absolute which overtaxed Schelling, and caused him to falter in his course,

[1] Vorlesungen über die Methode des akademischen Studiums, ix.

was pursued by Hegel with dauntless courage and unwearied industry. In marvellous contrast with Kant, Hegel saw no limiting circle of darkness anywhere in the universe. So far was he from regarding God as inaccessible to human insight that he makes Him completely knowable. "Philosophy," he says, "has the purpose to know the truth, to know God, for He is the absolute truth, in so far that nothing else, in comparison with God and His explication is worth one's pains."[1] God does not hide Himself. On the contrary, it pertains to His very nature to reveal Himself; for He is spirit, and spirit, as a unity of opposed elements, involves a process, a self-objectification and a return to self, a self-revelation. In this process of self-revelation God is revealed to man; for His Spirit is in man, and "it is the self-consciousness of God which knows itself in man's knowing."[2]

The possibility of this species of omniscience, which is assumed in the Hegelian system, is founded upon the identity of being with thought. As the sum total of reality is nothing but thought, it is only necessary that thinking should be pure and normal in order to be a reflex of all reality. True thinking is not a process of abstraction. The concrete alone is real, and the concrete is a unity of contraries. So thought which reflects the nature and order of being must move through a succession of triads, a process of conjoining two opposite notions and uniting them in a third or larger notion, of which they constitute the moments. Thus, "pure being" and "nothing," which stand at the

[1] Philosophie der Religion, Theil iii.

[2] Vorlesungen über die Beweise vom Daseyn Gottes.

beginning of the rational process, constitute moments of the third notion, "becoming." The like process carried forward gives other fundamental notions, which may be viewed as the primal categories or components of the absolute reason. This is the first great stage in the evolution of thought. In the second stage thought is externalized in nature. The culmination of nature is reached in the human organism. From this point begins the return movement, which completes the circle, in that thought comes back to a recognition of its source in the Absolute.

It accorded with Hegel's faculty for melting opposites into unity that he should assume a gracious attitude toward the leading truths of Christianity, and should invite them to take a place in his system. He has a good word for the theistic conception, maintaining that Spinoza should have added the principle of individuality to his doctrine of the unity of substance, and so have represented God as the absolute Person.[1] He declares the doctrine of the Trinity a philosophical necessity, and stigmatizes its opponents as destitute of intellectual depth, as being only *die sinnlichen und die Verstandes-Menschen.* He finds no speculative objection to the union of the divine and the human in Christ. The true infinite, he says, so far from excluding the finite, always includes it. Accordingly, Christ's consciousness of identity with God is to be accepted as a genuine reflex of the truth. In short, Hegel's formal attitude toward Christianity was as friendly as could well be desired. As respects the real bearing of his system, however, the advocate of Christian teaching in

[1] Logik, cap. viii.

its Catholic phases may well stand in doubt. There is reason for the suspicion that this pretentious Gnosticism, while it has its wealth of suggestion, is quite as much adapted to evaporate the substance of Christian doctrine as to afford it any real support. The dogmatic idealism of Hegel was a congenial basis for the mythical hypothesis of Strauss.

The brief sketch which has been given of these massive systems may have served to indicate that they ran across the current which had flowed from the Leibnitz-Wolfian philosophy. This was true in some measure of Kant's system. The characteristic confidence of the later Wolfians, the popular philosophers, was rebuked by the profound analysis of Kant, which showed that the problems to be solved were deeper and more difficult than they had accounted them. His teaching also, through the unconditional authority which he gave to the moral law, clashed with the eudemonism or utilitarianism which was largely cherished in the Wolfian school. But, on the other hand, there were aspects in Kant's teaching that were in line with the tendency of the preceding era. The deistic bent was in no wise corrected by him, and his disposition to reduce religion to morality was thoroughly agreeable to those who had adopted a rationalistic way of thinking. Accordingly, the theologians who built upon a Kantian basis were not distinguished by an evangelical spirit. While many of them gave a place to revelation, and were thus formally supernaturalists, they were disposed to leave in abeyance the more mystical side of Christianity, and to take account mainly of such an order of truth as was thought to be enforced by the practical reason. Rein-

hard and Storr were prominent representatives of this class. Others retreated altogether from the basis of supernaturalism, and carried rationalism to the farthest extreme that is consistent with any appearance of reverence for the Bible. Here belong Paulus, Wegscheider, and Röhr, who, however, might be associated with Wolf quite as properly as with Kant, since their conception of God was more after the teaching of the former than of the latter. Their system was essentially a deistic Unitarianism. While assigning a certain normative force to the Scriptures, they eliminate every trace of the supernatural. Paulus, in his exegetical treatises takes up the New Testament miracles in detail, and endeavors, without impeaching the honesty of the sacred writers, to show how they have misinterpreted mere natural occurrences. Wegscheider, in his book of systematic theology, treats the Biblical marvels quite as unsparingly, recognizing in them only products of uncritical enthusiasm and Oriental rhetoric. Röhr sees no place for divine intervention, since the world is a well-constructed machine, and only needed to be started in order to run on in complete fulfilment of its design.

Toward this type of thought, as toward the vulgar rationalism in general, the philosophies of Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel were pronouncedly hostile. If they had no special regard for miracles, viewed as external events, their overwhelming emphasis upon the divine immanence was antagonistic to the deistic element in rationalism. They gave an impulse therefore in a new direction. In some minds the result was a larger sympathy with the main features of the Catholic,

or orthodox, creed. But, as has been indicated, these philosophies were intrinsically doubtful allies of Catholic teaching, and only a moderate interval was needed to show the equivocal nature of their friendship. A signal illustration of their tendency was given among the Hegelians, who were specially numerous in the third and fourth decades of the century. While some of them sought to reconcile Hegelianism with orthodoxy, the extremists of the school drifted away from all genuine appreciation of Christianity.

At the time when this group of idealistic philosophies was in the field, a pervasive influence which worked with them against the old type of rationalism, though it had otherwise its distinctive tendency, came within the sphere of German theology. I refer to the writings of Schleiermacher, which made so deep an impress upon the theological thinking of Germany that historical fidelity requires us to give them some measure of specific attention. But before we reach Schleiermacher several other names need to be mentioned. He stands in a succession, the preceding members of which were Lessing, Herder, and Jacobi, each of whom made special contributions to the religious thought of the era.

Lessing belonged chronologically to the Wolfian era, since his death occurred in the same year that Kant published his "Critique of the Pure Reason." It was only shortly before this date, however, that his theological treatises were produced, and as respects the affinities which are revealed therein, it is quite as proper to associate him with the Kantian period as with the preceding. In some of his main points of view he may be said to have anticipated the teaching of Kant.

Lessing rather modified than abandoned the conception of positive religion or positive revelation. With Rousseau, he could not look upon it as strictly essential, and considered the scheme narrow and tyrannical which makes salvation unqualifiedly dependent upon adherence to any historical faith. The religion of reason he regarded as having alone a completely valid and permanent claim. At the same time he was far from accepting the rash conceit of superficial deism, that man's reason is always in condition to grasp the truth. He recognized, on the contrary, the need of guidance, training, education, in order to bring up the race to the plane of rational insight. He conceived of revelation, accordingly, as an educative process, a prolonged tuition, which first met the race in the estate of childhood, and by expedients suited to its condition led it forward to larger and maturer conceptions. The Bible is the record of this educative process. Much of it must be regarded as holding to religion the same relation which the scaffolding holds to a building. The building having been erected, the ideas intended to be conveyed having become a part of the fixed property of the human mind, dependence upon the historic revelation is no longer a necessity. For example, miracles may have served to commend certain truths to past times, but the truths having once obtained a footing in reason and conscience carry their own evidence in themselves, and can obtain little or no additional support from an historical record of miraculous workings. The proper goal of revelation will have been reached when the truths which it inculcates have all become truths of reason. This consummation, Lessing implies, is attainable. Instead of

protecting Christian mysteries by placing them, as did Leibnitz, above reason, or rejecting them, with Reimarus, as contrary to reason, he takes the view that the essential content of Christianity, including the doctrine of the Trinity and the incarnation, is in harmony with reason. That essential content did not wait for the New Testament books, to obtain an embodiment. Before the early Church had a New Testament canon, it had its *regula fidei* or brief compendium of faith, which may be regarded as the most primitive and authentic summary of Christian doctrine. That the Church at the start was thus relatively independent of book authority, may serve to teach us that the letter of revelation is not so exclusively the foundation of religion as has often been conceived. Truth, after once being introduced, has the energy and strength to hold its place, and its title will not be forfeited by the appearance of this or that imperfection in the written oracles.

In thus qualifying the permanent significance of the Bible, Lessing seems not to have duly considered how much more the Bible is than a compendium of precepts and doctrines. The difference between the Scriptures and a dogmatic outline is like that between a mere diagram and a veritable landscape, with its wealth of foliage and flowers, and its unique blending of light and shadow. Beyond the mere demands of the intellect, the Bible supplies food to the æsthetic sense, and to the entire emotional nature, so that as a book of edification, it must be adapted, so long as men dwell on the earth, to render an inestimable service. This point of view should have been more fully recognized by Lessing. Nevertheless, he must be credited with a

genuine contribution to theological thinking. No secure platform for apologetics can be found which does not include his fundamental conception of revelation as an historical process. That conception had received far too little attention in the preceding age.

Herder combined with a logical acuteness inferior to that of Lessing a wider range of information and of sympathy. His imagination and sensibility enabled him readily to transport himself to distant times and peoples, and to fulfil toward them the part of a congenial interpreter. As these gifts were joined with a devotional spirit, he was well qualified to discover and to appreciate the unique phases of the Biblical literature, — a literature which he regarded as none the less divine because he found it so deeply and truly human. Through his influence and direction not a few gained a truer and warmer impression as to the elements of beauty and nobility in the sacred volume. Especially was he instrumental in bringing to his countrymen a better understanding and appreciation of the poetic wealth of the Hebrew Scriptures. He pushed his investigation and reflection into a great number of fields, and in most of them his work was suggestive and stimulating, though it cannot be claimed that much of definite construction was accomplished by him. The outlines of his doctrinal system lie somewhat in the mist. While he had no sympathy with the shallow Illuminism of the time, no more could he regard a rigid orthodoxy with complacency. In his later years he is said to have followed Goethe too far toward the pantheistic stand-point.

Jacobi is noteworthy for combining the stanchest

conviction respecting supersensible realities with a very disparaging estimate of the office of demonstrative reasoning in relation to these realities. Demonstration, he claimed, even if it could be effected, would give us these objects only at second hand. The human spirit, in virtue of its constitution, has these objects already; it grasps them in advance of any discursive process. The rational nature of man is a direct medium of revelation. Through spontaneous feeling, or faith, he has an immediate assurance of divine verities. "Faith in God, freedom, virtue, and immortality," he says, "is the jewel of our race. It is the distinguishing mark of mankind. Faith is in the finite spirit of man the shadow of the divine knowing and willing." [1] A faith of this kind, which may be regarded as a species of inner vision, is invincibly grounded. "No demonstration," says Jacobi, "is valid against sense perception, since all demonstration is only a carrying back of the concept to the sense perception upon which it depends for verification; this in connection with a knowledge of nature is the first and the last, the unconditionally valid, the absolute. On the same ground no demonstration is valid against the soul's inner vision or intuitive apprehension, which makes known to us objects beyond nature,—that is, makes certain to us their reality and truth." [2]

Jacobi laid great stress upon the personality of God, and was never weary of combating pantheism. To derive all things from a predicateless ground seemed to him to involve insuperable difficulties. "From that point of view," he says, "we must conceive that every-

[1] Werke, ii. 55, 56, ed. 1815. [2] Ibid., ii. 59.

where the better proceeds from the worse, the higher from the inferior. This conclusion is as incongruous as it would be to derive being from nothing; yea, it is precisely the same thing."[1] To place the indeterminate and impersonal at the beginning is to destroy all basis of rational certitude. "Unless providence and freedom were at the beginning, they are nowhere, and consequently man is deceived by his own spirit, his own heart and conscience, which press upon him these conceptions as being most true. Man is made then a fable, a lie; a fable, a lie, also, man's God, the God of Socrates and Plato, the Christian's God."[2]

As Jacobi discovered in man's inner nature adequate credentials for the religious truths which he deemed of prime importance, he had very little room for the thought of an objective revelation. Christianity as an historical system received at his hands very scant consideration. We find nevertheless an indication that he profoundly reverenced the person of Christ, since he quotes in description of Him the well-known words of Richter: "The purest among the mighty, and the mightiest among the pure, who with His pierced hand lifted kingdoms off their hinges and the stream of the centuries out of its bed, and still commands the forward movement of the times."[3]

Jacobi's teaching served as a basis for an æsthetic school. One branch of this held to supernaturalism, while the other was more or less rationalistic. Within the latter De Wette was one of the best examples, both as respects breadth of learning and religious spirit. De Wette was more immediately connected

[1] Werke, ii. 83. [2] Ibid., ii. 123. [3] Ibid., iii. 427, 428.

with the philosophy of Fries, which, however, was closely related to that of Jacobi.

In important respects Schleiermacher came much nearer to the heart of Christianity than did Jacobi. It cannot be said, however, that he was as clearly and emphatically committed to the theistic stand-point. In truth if he is not to be explicitly accused of building on a pantheistic basis, he must at least be charged with approaching that basis. The evidence for this conclusion is not so much the warm encomium which he bestowed upon Spinoza in the course of his "Addresses to the Cultured," delivered in 1799, as in the misty character of his references to pantheism, and in the trend of his teaching on the divine attributes. In a later comment on the "Addresses," he answers the charge of pantheism, not by a direct affirmation of the personality of God, but rather by the twofold statement that on the one side it is almost a necessity of piety to represent God as personal, and on the other one must allow the essential imperfection and doubtful character of such representation. Also in his great work on Christian doctrine ("Der Christliche Glaube"), published in 1821, he grants that a belief which makes God simply the unitary ground of the world may serve very well as a foundation for religious feeling. His discussion of the divine attributes in the same work affiliates with this view of God. Reducing the attributes to mere human ways of representing that which is absolutely simple, cancelling thus all distinctions, leaving no difference between willing and thinking, or between omnipotence and omniscience, ruling away from God all thought of the possible as opposed to the actual, he

makes Him apparently just co-extensive with the world, not so much a transcendent Deity as the spiritual side of the world, the Absolute, whose utter lack of inner distinctions leaves no intelligible ground for proper self-consciousness or personality. Still, if Schleiermacher is to be charged with holding pantheism, it is necessary to draw consequences for him beyond those which he is recorded to have distinctly drawn for himself. While almost every page of his writings reveals his remoteness from the deistic view, or his strong emphasis upon the divine immanence, his language is in general theistic, and it is only here and there that one finds a glimmer of pantheistic conception breaking through the web of his reasonings.

The system of Schleiermacher owes its unique significance in no small degree to its combination of a pietistic with a churchly spirit. On the one hand it outlines with much freshness and vigor of thought a strongly subjective type of piety; on the other, it evinces a high appreciation of the office of the Christian communion. It renders tribute both to the ideal and the historical. It softens the dualism between the natural and the supernatural, and has in general a reconciling character. In its main embodiment, — the work of 1821, — it was designed to cement the union between the Lutherans and the Reformed, which had been set on foot by the Prussian government shortly before.

In the view of Schleiermacher the essence of religion lies in feeling. He argues that religion cannot consist in knowledge, since, in that event, the measure of knowledge respecting ethical and dogmatic truths would

be the measure of religion, and any one can see that this is not a true measure. No more can it consist in action, inasmuch as the same external performance may vary greatly in worth according to the motive lying back of it; moreover, there are internal states which, apart from all outward manifestation, we are compelled to regard as intrinsically pious. The conclusion accordingly holds that feeling is the essence of religion. This is not to be understood, however, as implying that knowing and acting have no relation to the subject. They are in fact closely connected with feeling. Though not of the essence of religion, they are very important accessories, as means of nurture and manifestation.

The central characteristic of religious feeling is an immediate sense of dependence. It is a self-consciousness which is at the same time a consciousness of relation to God. Within the circle of Christianity religious feeling is further distinguished as a consciousness of relation to Jesus of Nazareth as the Redeemer of men, a consciousness of needing or possessing the salvation which is provided in and through Him.

Christ, as Schleiermacher teaches, is to be regarded as the completion of creation, the second Adam, like unto the first, but distinguished from him, as from all other men, by a perfectly full and steady God-consciousness. In virtue of this God-consciousness, which implies a veritable existence of God in Him, He brings a new causality into the midst of the race, a positive redemptive agency. This is the aspect of supreme interest in His person. The story of His supernatural conception, which perhaps it is not neces-

sary to take literally, is of minor import. A secondary value also pertains to the miracles connected with Him, whether wrought by His hand upon men and nature, or appearing in such events of His own personal history as the resurrection and the ascension. It is indeed quite credible that a unique personality like Christ should have wrought miracles, or rather should have performed extraordinary works to which we attach the character of miracles because of the imperfection of our insight into the sphere of natural forces and laws. Still the important fact is that Christ stands above the ordinary human plane in His sinlessness and unclouded God-consciousness. This it is which qualifies Him to work forth into the organism of humanity, thus founding and progressively developing a commonwealth of redeemed men.

Salvation is effected by a spiritual union with the Redeemer through the medium of faith. His perfect God-consciousness becomes a vitalizing power in the believer. Viewed as thus united to Him who is at once an object of perfect divine complacency and a pledge of ultimate purity to all in association with Himself, the believer shares in the divine favor, and is reckoned as justified.

In uniting men to Himself, Christ unites them to each other. He is the head of an organism, a spiritual fraternity, in which a consciousness of salvation through a common Redeemer serves as a constant bond of union. The Church in its proper character is a necessary expression of the saving activity of Christ, and exhibits the progressive victory of His spirit over the minds and hearts of men. It is the household of the elect, the

special field of the Holy Spirit. Each member may thank the divine ordering rather than his own will for a place in this spiritual fellowship. The divine decree, however, must be regarded rather as fixing the order of entrance into the ranks of the saved than as excluding any. An irretrievable exclusion of a part of the race makes trouble for the Christian consciousness, and is not so clearly taught in the Scriptures but that it is permissible to entertain a better hope. Thus Schleiermacher retains the Reformed doctrine of predestination, but eliminates its sternness by combining it with a theory of universal restoration.

The New Testament writings are represented by Schleiermacher as the norm of the Christian Church. As for the Old Testament, he assigns it a very subordinate place. The appeals made to it in the New Testament he regards as addressed more particularly to those who had been educated in Judaism, an accommodation therefore to their standpoint, a prudent expedient for leading them to an appreciative understanding of Christian teachings. To those who start upon the Christian basis, the Old Testament, though interesting as a record of religious presentiment, has no special doctrinal significance, a far better light than it has to offer being already enjoyed. The writings of the New Testament must always remain normative, as they are an authentic expression of the Christian consciousness, and have received besides such an historic attestation as cannot be expected for any other compositions. It is possible, however, that they may be supplemented in some points; for the same Spirit which

was in the apostles remains with true believers, and inspiration is not the exclusive property of one era. In this view of an advancing Christian consciousness a hint was given which a number of Roman Catholic theologians were glad to employ in behalf of an improved conception of tradition, wherein this extra-Biblical authority appears rather as the unfolding consciousness of the Church than as a fixed deposit of doctrine.

It agreed with the indisposition of Schleiermacher to view God apart from the world, and apart from the demands of the Christian consciousness, that he should occupy a negative attitude toward the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity. He notes the speculative difficulties connected with the doctrine, and indicates a preference for the economic Trinity. In his scheme Father, Son, and Spirit denote respectively the Divine in itself, the Divine in the Redeemer, and the Divine in the Church. To go beyond this, and to inquire after eternal distinctions in the Godhead, he regarded as no demand of Christian feeling.

Schleiermacher's work has a measure of significance in the departments of ethics and exegesis. A distinguishing feature in connection with the former was the account which he made of individuality as modifying obligation. As to exegetical method, he favored the taking of Scripture in the broad view rather than by a piecemeal analysis.

In estimating the influence of Schleiermacher we need to remember his location in a transition age. Whatever dogmatic faults are contained in his system he gave an impulse toward evangelical thinking. Not

a few of his disciples came much nearer than he to confessional orthodoxy.[1]

A brief reference to the poets may properly be admitted into our sketch of the era. As the most renowned of these had their education in the time of maximum scepticism, we are not surprised to find that they occupied a somewhat negative attitude toward the Christian religion. Goethe's position was not uniform. "At times," says one of his biographers, "he approached the strictness of strict sects; at times he went whole lengths in scepticism. The Fräulein von Klettenberg taught him to sympathize with the Moravians; but Lavater's unconscious hypocrisy and the conscious hypocrisy and moral degradation of the Italian priesthood, gradually changed his respect for the Christian churches into open and sometimes sarcastic contempt of priests and priesthoods. In various epochs of his life he expressed himself so variously that a pietist may claim him, or a Voltairean may claim him; both with equal show of justice. The secret of this contradiction lies in the fact that he had deep religious senti-

[1] Dorner mentions, as representatives of the influence of Schleiermacher in the various departments, the following lists of theologians: In *exegesis*, Lücke, Bleek, Usteri, Neander, Schmid, Olshausen, Tholuck, Osiander, Messner, Riehm, Weiss, Lechler, Holzmann. In *history*, Neander, Hagenbach, Jacobi, Piper, Erbkam, Uhlhorn, Reuter, Gelzer, Hundeshagen, Stähelin, A. Schweizer, Hase, Henke, Baumgarten-Crusius. In *dogmatics*, Nitzsch, Twesten, Julius Müller, Rothe, Tholuck, Sack, Vogt, Hagenbach, Martensen, Liebner, von Hofmann, Auberlen, Ehrenfeuchter, Schöberlein, Lange, Ebrard, Landerer, Pelt, Thomsen, W Hoffmann, J. Köstlin, Reuter, Erbkam, Beyschlag, Gess. In *ethics*, Wirth, Chalybäus, Rothe, Schmid, Wuttke. In *practical theology*, Nitzsch, Ehrenfeuchter, Palmer, Liebner, Schöberlein, Brückner. (Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie, p. 814.)

ments, with complete scepticism on most religious doctrines. Thus when the Encyclopedists attacked Christianity he was ready to defend it; but when he was brought in contact with dogmatic Christians, who wanted to force their creed upon him, he resented the attempt, and answered in the spirit of his scepticism."[1]

A very definite philosophical system was not claimed by Goethe, nor can his thinking be credited with such a basis. Spinoza among philosophers received his largest appreciation. He felt soothed by his passionless calm, and was at one with him in unwillingness to admit any cleft between God and the world. The intra-mundane Deity was the only Supreme Being whom Goethe wished to recognize, — the Deity of whom nature is the living robe. His point of view was that of a poetic pantheism. While he approached Spinozism, he had a much keener sense for individuality than the Jewish sage. Indeed a Leibnitzian vein may be discerned in his way of contemplating man and the world. He maintained at once a strong hold upon the idea of distinct and continuous personality in man, and upon his kinship with nature, seeing with Leibnitz a graduated development in nature, and regarding the spiritual and the corporeal as only different sides of a single reality. In an unconscious, poetic manner he combined Spinoza and Leibnitz.[2]

It accorded with the literary comprehensiveness of Goethe that he should assign great value to the Bible. "The higher the centuries advance in knowledge," he

[1] Lewes, The Life and Works of Goethe, ii. 396.

[2] Compare Kuno Fischer, Geschichte der neuern Philosophie, ii. 869–872.

says, "the more can the Bible be used in part as the foundation and in part as the instrument of education, though not by imprudent, but by truly wise men." Other expressions equally appreciative are on record. We are warned, however, against assigning too large a meaning to these encomiums. The qualifying points of view must also be noticed. Perhaps the following words, written near the close of his life, indicate as fairly as any his total attitude toward the Biblical faith: "There are two stand-points from which the things of the Bible can be contemplated. There is the stand-point of a primitive religion, the religion of pure nature and reason, divine in its origin. This will remain eternally the same, and will hold a place so long as God-endowed beings exist. Still it is only for elect men, and is much too high and noble to become universal. There is accordingly the stand-point of the Church, which is more after a human pattern. It is infirm, unstable, and changing; still it will continue through everlasting change so long as weak human beings are found. The light of unclouded divine revelation is far too pure and bright for poor weak men to find it agreeable or endurable. The Church thus intervenes as a beneficent mediator to soften and to modify, so that all may be helped, and the welfare of many be secured. . . . I hold the four Gospels for thoroughly genuine, for there is operative in them the reflection of a greatness which emanated from the person of Christ, and which was of as divine a kind as ever appeared upon earth. If I am asked whether it is my nature to pay Him devout reverence, I say: Certainly! I bow before Him as the divine manifestation

of the highest principle of morality. If I am asked whether it is my nature to venerate the sun, I say again, Certainly! For it is likewise a manifestation of the highest Being, and indeed the mightiest that we children of earth are permitted to perceive. I adore in it the light and productive power of God, whereby alone we live, move, and subsist, and with us all plants and animals. If I am asked whether I am inclined to bow before a thumb-bone of the Apostle Peter or Paul, I say: Spare me, and keep aloof with your absurdities."[1]

Goethe's expressed willingness to venerate the sun as well as the Christ is not a little indicative of his real stand-point. The natural and the divine were conjoined in his view. The earthly inheritance seemed to him, for the time being, a sufficient kingdom of heaven. He was the serene world-child, bending an interested gaze upon all that was brought near to him, but without restless striving after the future and the invisible.

It is commonly admitted that Schiller's poetry, as a whole, is distinguished by a greater moral earnestness than that of Goethe. His native temper, as well as his study of Kant's philosophy, to which he was devoted for a time, made him prize deeply the energetic will which faces difficulty and pushes on toward the ideal. His formal attitude toward revealed religion was nevertheless quite as negative as was that of his illustrious contemporary. Indeed, it is much easier to quote favorable references to the Bible from Goethe than from Schiller. The latter, however, was not wholly silent or antagonistic. In a letter which he wrote to Goethe in 1795, he thus expressed his appreciation of

[1] Quoted by Filtsch, Goethe's Stellung zur Religion.

the Christian ideal: "I find in the Christian religion virtually the foundation for the highest and the noblest, and its manifestations in men's lives appear to me only on this account so repugnant and insipid, because they are mutilated expressions of this highest. If one directs his attention to the essential characteristic of Christianity, which distinguishes it from all monotheistic religions, he will find it in nothing else than the abrogation of law, the abrogation of the Kantian imperative, in place of which Christianity aims to introduce a free inclination. It is thus in its pure form an expression of a beautiful morality, or of the incarnation of the holy, and in this sense the only æsthetic religion." [1]

Schiller died in 1805, Goethe in 1832. Shortly before the former date, a new school of poetry, the Romantic, had come on to the stage, the chief exponents being Novalis, Tieck, Frederic Schlegel, A. W. Schlegel, and Werner. The school represented a most pronounced reaction against rationalism. It was also averse to making so much of classic models as was done by Goethe and Schiller, and claimed a larger appreciation for the literature of mediæval and early modern times. Patient and consistent elaboration it did not seek after. It was the school of subjectivity and fantasy, entertaining rather by flashes of genius and swift, vague flights than by those carefully drawn pictures which the greatest poets have fashioned to be the immortal companions of the human mind. Speaking as the exponent of his school, Frederic Schlegel says: "The beginning of all poesy is to abolish the course

[1] Quoted by Scherer, "Schiller, und seine Zeit."

and the laws of reasoned thinking, and to transfer ourselves into the beautiful confusion of fantasy, into the original chaos of human nature. That is Romantic which presents a sentimental subject in a fantastic form, that is, in a form wholly determined by the fantasy."[1] Among the current philosophies that of Schelling was most appreciated by the advocates of Romanticism. It accorded with the bent of the school which found in the middle ages its most congenial historical field, and which preferred a warmly colored mythology to sober reality, that a number of its leading representatives should pass into the Romish Church.

The same age which presents us with the names of the most illustrious German poets records also the achievements of a supreme musical talent. Beethoven (1770–1827) was a younger contemporary of Schiller and Goethe. Mendelssohn was born four years after the death of Schiller, and made his public appearance as musical performer in 1819, when ten years of age. Glück had won favor in the middle part of the preceding century, and the striking career of Mozart covered the latter portion of that century, his death occurring in 1792.

IV. — CHIEF EVENTS IN SWEDEN, THE NETHERLANDS, AND SWITZERLAND.

The most noteworthy contribution of Sweden to the history of the period was a peculiar product of the mystical or theosophic spirit. In constructive talent, or

[1] Quoted by Hettner, Die Romantische Schule.

in capacity for minute analysis and patient elaboration, no mystic of the eighteenth century takes precedence of the founder of the New Church. However much of the fanciful entered into the thinking of Emanuel Swedenborg, he must be allowed, to a very large extent, the merit of consistency. His writings present, not disjointed vagaries, but a coherent system. Some of his earlier revelations, it is true, were not so perfect but that he had occasion to revise certain items; still throughout the great body of his works one finds a high measure of agreement.

This characteristic of systematic and consistent representation on the part of Swedenborg is explained in large part by the long period of scientific study and reflection which preceded his supposed office of revelator. As a seer he clothed in a new drapery many of the thoughts to which he had already become partial as a scientist.

Swedenborg was born in 1688. After taking the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Upsal in 1709, he spent several years in foreign study and travel. In 1717, by royal appointment, he was made an assessor in the College of Mines. His official duties were not exacting, and he found leisure to write largely upon scientific subjects, as also to enlarge the sphere of his information by visits to neighboring countries. The connection of this line of activity with his subsequent vocation was not ignored by Swedenborg himself, as appears from these words which he wrote to Oetinger in 1766: "I was introduced by the Lord into the natural sciences, and thus prepared, and indeed from the year 1710 to 1744, when heaven was opened

to me."[1] From the date of this initiation, if we may accept his own account, he was a man of two worlds, and advanced rapidly to a familiar acquaintance with the whole kingdom beyond, both on its heavenly and on its infernal side. "The Lord opened my eyes," he says, "very often daily, so that in mid-day I could see into the other world, and in a state of perfect wakefulness converse with angels and spirits."

Swedenborg's assumption as to his calling was of the most daring order. He claimed in effect to be the apostle of a new dispensation, the medium for introducing the New Jerusalem which John saw in prophetic vision descending from heaven. Writing shortly before his death, he thus described his unique instrumentality: "Since the Lord cannot manifest Himself in person, and yet He has foretold that He would come and establish a new Church, which is the New Jerusalem, it follows that He is to do it by means of a man, who is able not only to receive the doctrines of the Church with his understanding, but also to publish them by the press. That the Lord has manifested Himself before me, His servant, and sent me on this office, and that after this, He opened the sight of my spirit, and thus let me into the spiritual world, and gave me to see the heavens and the hells, and also to speak with angels and spirits, and this now continually for many years, I testify in truth."[2] This bringing of the New Jerusalem into this world was closely associated, not to say identified, in the mind of Swedenborg, with the

[1] Quoted by Benjamin Worcester, "Life and Mission of Swedenborg," p. 171.

[2] True Christian Religion, n. 779.

disclosure of the spiritual sense of the Scriptures. Christ comes in glory and tabernacles with men through this disclosure. In giving a meaning of this kind to the second coming of the Lord, Swedenborg, did not design to disconnect it from the final judgment. That judgment, he maintained, took place in the year 1757, and was a great crisis in the spiritual world, though there was no disturbance within the sphere of visible nature.

A cardinal feature in Swedenborg's system is the doctrine of correspondences. Everything in a lower range, as he conceived, has its archetype in a higher range. God is the archetype of man. In fact, "God is very man," only infinite instead of finite. The incarnation accordingly was the superinducing of a visible humanity upon an already existing humanity. In Heaven there is no other thought of God than that of a man. The form of heaven itself is that of a man, as is also the form of each angelic society. Angels are but men, and their life is very largely the earthly life transfigured and carried up to a higher potency. Heaven has its sun, like the earthly sun in appearance, only more glorious, the vivifying source of spiritual heat and light, the manifest love and wisdom of God. The Scriptures are a heavenly book as well as an earthly, a needful mirror of eternal truths to the angels no less than to men. In their threefold sense, — the celestial, the spiritual, and the natural, — they image the highest, the intermediate, and the lowest heaven. If we descend to the earthly plane we find here also abundant examples of resembling phases in different orders of being. Man's body reflects his soul. The

heart corresponds to the will, and the lungs to the understanding. The characteristics in man are patterns for the lower kingdoms, reaching down even to the mineral.

This theory of correspondences has, it must be confessed, its engaging aspect, as favoring unity of view. At the same time, the way in which it is carried out involves a serious forfeit. It is no injustice to say that Swedenborg imports into the spiritual world large elements of mechanism and materialism. His representations, for example, of the heavenly sun turn the ethical and the intellectual into the physical. This orb he declares is the manifest love and wisdom of God. Nevertheless, he represents it as acting like the natural sun. "This sun," he says, "is distant from the angels as the sun of the natural world is from men, in order that it may not touch them with its naked rays immediately; for thus they would be consumed like a firebrand thrown into the naked sun." [1] Surely a divine love which is thus in danger of burning up its objects is not so much infinite tenderness as a mere physical energy! A like outcropping of materialistic conception appears in the balanced relation which Swedenborg assumes between heaven and hell, and in the conclusion that this relation is the necessary condition of freedom. The following passages will illustrate sufficiently: "Because the relation of heaven to hell, and of hell to heaven, is like that between two opposites, which mutually act against each other, from whose action and reaction results an equilibrium wherein all things subsist, therefore in order that all things and every single thing

[1] True Christian Religion, n. 641

may be held in equilibrium, it is necessary that He who governs the one should also govern the other. . . . The Lord is continually withdrawing man from evil, and leading him to good, while hell is continually leading him into evil. Unless man were between both, he would have no thought, nor any will, still less any freedom and choice; for man enjoys all these in consequence of the equilibrium between good and evil. . . . The equilibrium between the heavens and the hells is diminished or increased according to the number of those who enter them, which amounts to many thousands every day. But to know and perceive which way the balance inclines, and to regulate and equalize it with precision, is not in the power of any angel, but of the Lord alone. . . . All the societies of heaven are arranged most distinctly according to goods, and their genera and species; and all the societies of hell according to evils, and their genera and species; and beneath every society of heaven there is a society of hell corresponding to it in the way of opposition, from which opposite correspondence there results an equilibrium."[1] In harmony with these representations a decidedly physical aspect is given to the redemptive work of Christ. A principal part of that work is declared to have been the subjugation of the hells, the driving of the infernal genii down into their deep caverns.[2] This work Swedenborg makes as necessary for angels in heaven as for men upon earth, and offers in explanation the following singular description: "The reason that angels could not have subsisted in a state of in-

[1] Heaven and Hell, n. 536, 516, 593, 594.

[2] True Christian Religion, n 2, 86, 115, 118, 121, 124.

tegrity unless redemption had been performed by the Lord, is because the whole angelic heaven, together with the church on earth, is before the Lord as one man, whose internal is the angelic heaven, and whose external is the church; or, more particularly, the highest heaven constitutes the head; the second and the last constitute the breast and middle region of the body; and the church on earth, the loins and feet; and the Lord Himself is the soul and life of the whole of this man: wherefore, unless the Lord had performed redemption, this man would have been destroyed as to the feet and loins, by the seceding of the church on earth; as to the gastric region, by the seceding of the lowest heaven; as to the breast, by the seceding of the second heaven; and then the head, having no correspondence with the body, would fall into a swoon." [1] The artificial mechanism into which Swedenborg was disposed to run is well illustrated in his conception of the three heavens referred to in the passage just cited. Instead of one common family of redeemed children, having free communion with each other, and with their Lord, he pictures three disparate realms without means of direct interchange. "In the supreme heaven," he says "the angels are in all perfection superior to the angels of the middle heaven; and in the middle heaven the angels are in all perfection superior to the angels of the lowest heaven. The degrees of perfection are such that the angels of the lowest heaven cannot ascend to the first limit of the perfections of the angels of the middle heaven, nor these to the first limit of the perfections of the angels of the supreme

[1] True Christian Religion, n. 119.

heaven. This seems a paradox, but still it is true, for the angels are associated according to discrete degrees, and not according to continuous degrees. It has been made known to me by experience that there is such a difference between the affections and thoughts, and consequently the speech, of the angels of the superior and inferior heavens that they have nothing in common, and that communication is effected only by correspondences, which exist by immediate influx of the Lord into all the heavens, and by mediate influx through the supreme into the lowest heaven." [1]

As respects the current teaching of the Church, Swedenborg assumed a decidedly polemical attitude toward the doctrine of a Trinity of Persons in the Godhead, and was also very averse to including in the theory of Christ's redemptive work any notion of satisfaction or propitiation. In place of the ordinary formula for the Trinity, he substituted the representation that the whole Trinity was in the Lord incarnate, the Father in Him being the Divine, the Son the Divine Human, and the Holy Spirit the proceeding or operating Divine. The three names stand, not for three Divine Persons, but for three essentials of the one God, even as soul, body, and operation are essentials of the individual man.

A few years after the death of Swedenborg, in 1772, his teaching was made the basis of a distinct communion. Societies were organized in various parts of England, on the Continent, and in America. Swedenborgianism, however, came too late to win many disci-

[1] Angelic Wisdom concerning the Divine Love and the Divine Wisdom, n. 202.

ples of the stricter sort; at least, it finds a special barrier in a line of thought which has been continually advancing toward general acknowledgment in the present century. The whole trend of modern Biblical scholarship, with its profound emphasis upon the historical basis of revelation, stands in radical opposition to Swedenborg's procedure in swinging the Bible almost entirely clear of historical connections, and reading into any portion of it indiscriminately the truths which belong to the climax of divine revelation. Some phases of modern science, or scientific theory, may show, it is true, a certain kinship with the thinking of the gifted Swede; but this fact is far from offsetting the impression that his dealing with the Bible was of a highly artificial character.

In the last years of the eighteenth and the first of the nineteenth century, a religious movement of some practical moment invaded the calm of the Lutheran Church in the Scandinavian countries. A lay evangelist, Hans Nielsen Hauge, son of a peasant, was the principal agent in the movement. Travelling extensively, especially in Norway, and preaching with great earnestness, he effected a considerable awakening. Persecution interrupted and finally closed his labors, his strength being broken by long imprisonment; but the impulse which he had given to lay evangelism continued to manifest itself.

The Netherlands underwent several political transitions during the period, some of which had a perceptible effect upon church affairs. In 1747 the Prince of Orange was acknowledged as stadtholder of the seven

provinces. Moreover, large powers were connected with his office, and it was made hereditary in his family. Only a step now lay between the house of Orange and acknowledged royalty. That step, however, was not to be taken till after a series of overturnings. The French Revolution early swept away the political structure of the United Netherlands. In 1795 the Batavian Republic was constituted. Eleven years later this gave place, at the instance of Napoleon, to the kingdom of Holland, under Louis Bonaparte. In 1810 this kingdom was incorporated with the French Empire. After the overthrow of Napoleon, the Netherlands, with Belgium added, were erected into a kingdom (1814), over which the house of Orange was given the sovereignty. The joint realm did not prove to be sufficiently homogeneous to hold together. An agitation zealously fomented by the Romish priesthood resulted in the acknowledgment of Belgium as a separate realm (1830–1839).

With the establishment of the Batavian Republic the Dutch Reformed Church lost its privileged position before the State. During the changes which followed in the Napoleonic era, its organization was not a little impaired. The erection of the new kingdom under the house of Orange gave an opportunity to reconstitute its government, and opened the way also to a sufficiently close connection with the civil power.

As a field of theological activity, the Netherlands were not so highly distinguished in the eighteenth as in the seventeenth century. Still names of considerable distinction were added to the long list which had been handed down from the former period. Among

those representing the State Church were Vitringa, Lampe, Schultens, and Venema. The Remonstrants, on their part, added to their theological succession — which had been continued from Arminius through Episcopius, Curcellæus, and Limborch — the names of Le Clerc, Wettstein, and Van Hemert.

In the tenor of their thinking, various writers, both in the Calvinistic and the Remonstrant party, shared in the developments which were characteristic of contemporary German theology. Near the middle of the eighteenth century there were indications of a relaxed dogmatism, and at the end of the century there was a distinct outcropping of rationalism.

A corresponding movement occurred in Switzerland. A majority of the pastors at Geneva in the first years of the nineteenth century were more in sympathy with the abridged creed of average German rationalism than with the rigorous system which had gone forth from their city to conquer a large part of Europe. At Zurich a like transformation was witnessed. Basle, on the other hand, continued to maintain a conservative position.

CHAPTER V.

THE RUSSIAN CHURCH (1725–1825).

SO little of special interest is found in the record of the other portions of the Eastern Church for the eighteenth century, that our attention may properly be limited to the Russian branch. Since the days of Peter the Great Russia has been the most important theatre of the Greek type of Christianity.

If we take the governmental point of view, we may specify four eras in Russian history between the death of Peter the Great and the second quarter of the nineteenth century. At least four of the reigns included in this interval had each its distinctive character.

The first was that of Anna Ivanovna (1730–1740). The peculiarity of this reign was the partiality of the Empress for German counsellors, and the extent to which they were made the instruments of her despotic rule. The jealousy of the Russians was excited by seeing them placed in the foremost positions, and using their authority with scant regard for the traditions of the country. The clergy in particular were exasperated by the way in which their privileges were abridged, as also by the harsh treatment which some eminent representatives of their order experienced. A resentment in fact was awakened, which only awaited the opportunity to declare itself in a pronounced reaction.

The reaction came in the reign of Elizabeth (1741–1762). Her accession was greeted with an outburst of national and orthodox zeal. Not a few sympathized with the Archbishop of Novgorod, who celebrated the displacement of the German favorites as the overthrow of the "emissaries of Beelzebub and his angels." Various practical indications were given of an awakened affection for the national Church. The Armenian houses of worship in the two capitals were ordered to be suppressed; the Jews were put under the ban as enemies of Christ, and injurious to her Majesty's subjects; and missionary work was pushed forward in the border districts, the civil power aiding the enterprise by such helpful measures as destroying mosques, and releasing all candidates for baptism from the obligations of servitude.

The reign of Catharine II. (1762–1796), distinguished outwardly by a large extension of the Russian empire, was noteworthy as respects internal administration for the exhibition of a relative tolerance in matters of religion, for a revision of the system of ecclesiastical revenues, and for the promotion of an intellectual awakening tinged more or less with free-thinking. The first point was illustrated in the release of schismatics from special burdens, in the permission given to the Tartars on the Volga to rebuild the mosques of which they had been deprived by the harsh policy of Elizabeth, and in allowing the Jesuits, after the dissolution of the Order by papal decree, to find a refuge in White Russia. The interference with ecclesiastical revenues had an occasion in the unequal distribution and abnormal engrossment of Church property. The

number of peasants attached to the clergy is said to have amounted well-nigh to a million. One monastery had thirty-five thousand, and another a hundred and twenty thousand.[1] Carrying out the designs of some of her predecessors, Catharine extended State control over the revenues of the Church, and provided that foundations having a superabundant income should contribute the surplus to schools and public benevolences. The intellectual quickening which distinguished the reign was confined mostly to the higher class, and was due largely to communication with France. The nobility were somewhat taken with French manners, and gave some place to the sceptical philosophy which was rife among the French literati at that time. Catharine herself was in familiar correspondence with Voltaire and Diderot. However, neither Catharine nor the Russian aristocracy was sufficiently inoculated with the French virus to welcome any serious change in the social or political structure. The first notes of the Revolution caused a change of front. With regicidal and republican France Catharine and her court wanted no fellowship. Russian soil was far from being prepared for the doctrines of equality which were preached at Paris. A part at least of the conduct of Catharine stood at a vast remove from those doctrines. While she cherished in the first part of her reign some good wishes for the great body of serfs in the realm, she ended by enlarging the area of serfdom, and sanctioned odious prerogatives in the masters of the downtrodden class.

The rule of Alexander I. (1801–1825) was distin-

[1] Rambaud, History of Russia.

guished, for the major part, by its liberality and progressive animus. The barriers against foreign books and journals were mostly removed. The censorship of the press was moderated. Agents of the London Bible Society were allowed to have an establishment at St. Petersburg, and to take part in the enterprise of distributing the Scriptures in the vernacular. A more thorough system of public education than had been attempted before in Russia was set on foot. English and German literature was introduced, and a deeper intellectual activity was probably awakened than that which had been started in the reign of Catharine II. But, as the powerful Empress had her season of reaction, so also Alexander I. In his later years he seemed to be apprehensive that the spirit of innovation would be pushed to a dangerous extreme. He accordingly adopted the policy of suspicion and limitation. His patronage was withdrawn from the Bible societies. The censorship of the press was sharpened, and police surveillance was made more general and penetrating. A retrograde movement of this kind, after so considerable a trial of a liberal policy, naturally did not fully achieve its aim. There were at least some minds that were exasperated by the change, and were prepared to cultivate as members of secret associations the opinions which could not be promulgated openly.

The watchfulness and jealousy which were finally aroused in Alexander I. were not consistent with a continued toleration of the Jesuits, who had been allowed in 1801 to pass beyond the bounds of White Russia. As they appeared to be using their opportunity to make proselytes, they were banished in 1816

from the two capitals, and in 1820 from the whole empire.

During the eighteenth century the Russian clergy as a body could still claim little distinction as respects learning. While there were seminaries for the education of priests, many of the candidates for orders did not enter them, and those who did enter obtained a very imperfect equipment for their office. The curriculum was ill-chosen. "Philosophy lay in the bonds of scholasticism, theology in those of a polemical dialectic. Much of the unnecessary was learned, little of the necessary."[1] This state of things continued till the early years of the nineteenth century, when a new impulse was given to clerical education. "Toward the end of the reign of Alexander I. there were already in the villages many priests who had received a full seminary training, whereas under Catharine II. priests who were wholly destitute of school learning were to be found even in the cities."[2]

Monasticism, though remaining an important factor in the religious life of the Russians, did not fully keep pace with the growth of the Church. The new provisions which Catharine II. introduced for the management of ecclesiastical revenue occasioned the closing of many monastic houses. The total number of cloisters in 1810 was four hundred and fifty-two.[3]

The reign of Catharine II., as has been intimated, marked the beginning of a milder dealing with the schismatics, or Raskolniki. The double tax which had been imposed upon them was not henceforth exacted,

[1] Philaret, Geschichte der Kirche Russlands, ii. 200.

[2] Ibid., ii. 204. [3] Ibid., ii. 284.

and in other ways they were treated with increased consideration. One reason for this leniency was doubtless the political weight of the Raskolniki. Though they were confined almost wholly to the peasant class, and to tradesmen and artisans from the ranks of the peasants, it became a necessary part of state-craft to take account of them, since they had stanch convictions, and, whatever differences prevailed among them, were substantially a unit in their conservative bent, their attachment to old forms and ways in Church and State. A careful student of their opinions and condition has reported them as constituting, at the time of his investigation, the best part of the Russian peasantry both as to morals and intelligence. While the schismatics were in possession of only a few books, a large proportion of them were able to read these, and were familiar with their contents.[1]

Near the middle of the eighteenth century another group of sectaries arose, quite distinguished in spirit from the Raskolniki. While the latter were sticklers for tradition, and laid great stress upon special items of ceremonial, the former appealed from the outward form to the inner spirit, and were disposed to reduce ceremonial well-nigh to the vanishing-point. Some have connected their origin with Quakerism. How much of actual connection there was with the disciples of Fox and Penn stands in question; but that there is a certain resemblance between the teachings of the Russian and the English sectaries is not to be denied. One branch of these anti-formalists, called the Molokani,

[1] Haxthausen, Studien über die innern Zustände Russlands, 1847, Band I. cap. xiii.

though exhibiting a spice of rationalistic freedom in the interpretation of the Bible, aim to build upon its authority, and accept much that enters into the average creed of Protestantism. Their most pronounced antagonism to the stand-point of Greek orthodoxy is on the subject of priesthood and sacraments. Repudiating the whole ceremonial basis, they can see in the priest only the representative of the congregation, and in the sacraments only symbolical rites. A second class, styled Doukhobortsi, exhibit a much wider divergence from the ordinary standards, retaining the doctrine of the Trinity only in terms, teaching the pre-existence of souls and their fall prior to their existence in this world, making little account of the outward facts in the life of Christ, substituting for the common view of His person the idea of a progressive incarnation of God in the race, and in general regarding the Bible as a book of symbols. For visible sacraments and a special priesthood they have no place.

A sombre mysticism, associated with ascetic aberrations, and a marked predilection for prophesyings, was represented by such sects as the Khlysti and the Skoptsi. The former derive their name from the use of the scourge. They engage in the whirling dance as a means of religious excitation. Their repudiation of marriage is said to have ministered quite as much to libidinous excess as to continence. The Skoptsi hold that in making themselves eunuchs they attain the highest fitness for the kingdom of heaven.

THE END.